



BR 60 .L52 v.46  
Athanasius, d. 373.  
Later treatises of S.  
Athanasius, Archbishop of









LATER TREATISES  
OF  
S. ATHANASIUS,  
ARCHBISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA,  
WITH NOTES;  
AND  
AN APPENDIX  
ON  
S. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA  
AND  
THEODORET.

OXFORD,  
JAMES PARKER AND CO.,  
AND RIVINGTONS,  
LONDON, OXFORD, AND CAMBRIDGE.

1881.

PRINTED BY THE DEVONPORT SOCIETY OF THE HOLY TRINITY,  
HOLY ROOD, OXFORD. 1881.

### *Observations.*

---

The times, for which God raised up S. Athanasius, have, in many respects, a counterpart in our own. There is, now too, earnest, ever-enlarging, adherence to the faith, in those who hold it. But there is also a wide-spread dislike of definite doctrine, such as found a vent in the different shades of Arianism. They framed eleven Creeds, to satisfy themselves or others, over-against the one faith, put forth at Nicæa and accepted by the whole Church. They swung to and fro, at times approximating nearer to the truth ; but their secret maxim, unknown to themselves, was, ‘anything but the Truth.’

The human mind, in matters of faith as well as practice, hates restraint. Revelation has disclosures of Divine truth which man’s intellect may search out in adoring love, while it can never fathom the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God. Still, it *is* a restraint. It is a promise of the Gospel, “<sup>a</sup> Thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left.” So then to those, who do not openly break with it, yet still cling to their own individual conceptions of God, there are the old Semi-Arian

<sup>a</sup> Is. xxx. 21.

temptations to take so much of it as will satisfy their consciences in parting with the rest. The world is in one wide rebellion; speaking, in the Name of God, against truths of God; setting His Infinite Love against His awful Holiness, and renewing the Serpent's question, "Hath God indeed said?" With the Serpent too, it misrepresents what God did say.

So far, 'The Prophet of Truth's Creed<sup>b</sup>,' five times banished for the truth's sake, at other times, compelled, like Elijah, to flee for his life, hiding in dens and caves of the earth, hunted by those who sought it, says, in all which he does say;

"One only way to life :  
One Faith, delivered once for all<sup>c</sup>."

But S. Athanasius speaks more nearly to us, who would defend that faith. Wide as differences now are, the adherence to the maxims and principles of S. Athanasius may prevent their being wider, or may win many to the whole truth. It is a great step to understand one another. 'S. Athanasius looked through words into meanings.' 'One of the characteristic points in S. Athanasius,' said Card. Newman 40 years ago, 'is his constant attention to the *sense* of doctrine, or the *meaning* of writers, in preference to the words used.'

S. Athanasius knew that the Nicene Creed contained "the faith once delivered to the saints;" that "which they who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" handed down to us; that '*the Word of the Lord* spoken through the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea abideth

<sup>b</sup> *Lyra Apostolica*. No. 94. Athanasius.

<sup>c</sup> Ib. No. 100. Dissent. <sup>d</sup> below p. 11.

<sup>e</sup> Nicene Def. p. 17. note m. <sup>f</sup> *Ad Afr.* § 2; below p. 26.

for ever ;' that the Arians worshipped a different God from the true God<sup>g</sup> ; that those who worshipped a different God were not really Christians<sup>h</sup> ; that for an Arian to worship Christ was an act of idolatry<sup>i</sup>.

Still, neither in his own defences of the truth against Arianism does he put forward the word which specially condemns it, nor does he require it of those who were finding their way back to the faith.

The Church could not have dropped the word 'homoousios' without forfeiting the faith. There was nothing to induce her to abandon this statement of the truth, if she still held the truth itself. Arianizers or Semi-Arians, who in their various Creeds tried to displace it, did hold a different faith. Still, there was no occasion to put in the front just the word, against which minds were most set. S. Cyril of Jerusalem, we all know, never used it in his Catechetical lectures, but a term 'like in all things<sup>k</sup>', which at first sight suggests too much and too little; too much, because the Father is the Father, and the Son is the Son ; too little,

<sup>g</sup> 'They do not believe the God that is, and there is none other but He.' adv. Serapion. iv. 6.

<sup>h</sup> 'They who call these men [Arians] Christians are in great and grievous error, as neither having studied Scripture, nor understanding Christianity at all, and the faith which it contains.' Ag. Arians i. 1. p. 179. O. T. 'How can they be any longer Christians, since they conceive of a different God from the existing God?' (Ad Epict. n. 9; below p. 56.)

<sup>i</sup> 'Who told them, after abandoning the worship of creatures, after all to draw near and worship a creature and a work?' Orat. i. § 5. p. 191. Oxf. Tr. Add Orat. ii. § 14. p. 301 O.T., Letter to Eg. Lib. § 4 (Hist. Tr. p. 129), § 13. (Ib. p. 141.) Letter to Adelph. (below p. 63, and note g ib.)

<sup>k</sup> κατὰ πάντα or ἐν πᾶσιν ὅμοιον Catech. iv. 7; xi. 4 and 10.

because we use the word 'like,' of things which have a separate existence. Yet one<sup>1</sup> who had made S. Athanasius one of his almost life-long studies says;

"He introduces the word, I think, only once into his three celebrated *Orations*, and then rather in a formal statement of doctrine than in the flow of his discussion, viz. *Orat.* i. 4. [3.] Twice he gives utterance to it in the Collection of Notes which make up what is called his fourth *Oration* (*Orat.* iv. 9. 12.) [pp. 523, 527. O.T.] We find it indeed in his *de Decretis Nic. Conc.* and his *de Synodis*; but there it constitutes his direct subject, and he discusses it, in order, when challenged, to defend it. And in his work against Apollinaris he says, *όμοιούσιος ἡ τριάς*, i. 9. [below p. 96.] But there are passages of his *Orations*, in which he omits it, when it was the natural word to use; *vid.* the notes on *Orat.* i. 20, 21, [p. 210. O.T.] and 58 *fin.* [p. 264. Ib.] Moreover the word does not occur in the *Catecheses* of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, A. D. 317, nor in the recantation made before Pope Julius by Ursacius and Valens A. D. 349, nor in the cross-questionings to which S. Ambrose subjected Palladius and Secundianus A. D. 381."

"Indeed no better illustration can be given of that intrinsic independence of a fixed terminology which belongs to the Catholic Creed, than the writings of Athanasius himself, the special Doctor from whom the subsequent treatises of Basil, the two Gregories, and Cyril are derived. This great author scarcely uses any of the scientific phrases which have since been received in the Church and have become dogmatic; or if he introduces them, it is to give them senses which have long been superseded. A good instance of his manner is afforded by the long passage, *Orat.* iii. 30—58, which is full of theology, with scarcely a dogmatic word. The case is the same with his treatment of the Incarnation.

<sup>1</sup> Card. Newman, 'On S. Cyril's formula of the *μία φύσις*,' *Tracts Theol. and Eccl.* pp. 291, 292. <sup>m</sup> Ib. p. 293.

No one surely can read his works without being struck with the force and exactness with which he lays down the outlines and fills up the details of the Catholic dogma, as it has been defined since the controversies with Nestorius and Eutyches, who lived in the following century; yet the word *θεοτόκος*, which had come down to him, like *όμοούσιος*, by tradition, is nearly the only one among those which he uses, which would now be recognised as dogmatic.'

‘<sup>n</sup> The Encyclical letter of S. Alexander [on the deposition of Arius], after S. Athanasius' manner of treating of sacred subjects, has hardly one scientific term.'

Nay, the same writer observes<sup>o</sup>, that he employs more frequently terms employed by the Semi-Arians.

‘For some reason, probably from a feeling of charity, as judging it best to inculcate first the revealed truth itself as a mode of introducing to the faithful and defending the orthodox symbol, and shewing its meaning and its necessity, he uses the phrase *όμοιος κατὰ πάντα*, and *όμοιούσιος* more commonly than *όμοούσιος*:—this I have noted elsewhere.’

E. g. *όμοιος κατὰ πάντα*. ‘He Who is in the Father and like the Father in all things.’ Orat. i. § 40. ‘Being the Son of God, He must be like Him.’ Orat. ii. § 17. ‘The Word is unlike us, and like the Father.’ Orat. iii. § 20; also i. § 21, 40; ii. § 18, 22. Ep. Agypt. 17.

And *όμοιος κατ’ οὐσίαν*. ‘Unless indeed they give up shame, and say that ‘Image’ is not a token of similar substance, but His name only.’ Orat. i. § 21. vid. also Orat. i. § 20 init. 26; iii. § 11, 26, 67. Syn. § 38; Alex. Enc. § 2.

Since such was his own habit, it followed that he looked upon the Semi-Arians, as ‘<sup>p</sup>much loved’

<sup>n</sup> Card. Newman, notes on Select Treatises of S. Athanasius, T. ii. p. 3. See (in 1844) S. Ath. Hist. Tracts App. p. 297.

<sup>o</sup> Id. Ib. T. ii. pp. 433, 434

<sup>p</sup> Conc. Arim. et Sel. § 43. p. 141. Ox. Tr.

and ‘<sup>4</sup>brothers,’ and says that confessing what they did, ‘they are not far from accepting even the phrase, ‘one in substance,’ of whom is Basil of Aneyra, in what he has written concerning the faith.’ They were inconsistent, and S. Athanasius looked, so far, to the truth which they held, or their approximations to the truth, and looked away from their errors which he hoped that they would shake off ; and his anticipations were verified<sup>5</sup>.

The same moderation was shewn in the terms<sup>6</sup> which he suggested that those at Antioch should propose to S. Meletius (whom the Semi-Arians had consecrated Bishop of Antioch, but who had joined the Church), and in his peace-loving words.

S. Gregory Nazianzen says in regard to the division about the words ‘hypostasis’ and ‘Ousia ;’

“<sup>7</sup> He applies to the sickness a medicine of his own. How? By inviting both sides so meekly and lovingly ; and examining accurately the meaning of what was said ; when he found them to agree and in no wise to differ as to the doctrine, *conceding the names*, he bound them together in the substance. This was more beneficial

<sup>4</sup> Ib. n. 41. p. 139.

<sup>5</sup> S. Ath. Counc. Arim. and Sel. n. 31. p. 127. “Well I know, not even under these circumstances will they stop, as many as have now dissembled, but they will always be making parties against the truth, until they return to themselves and say, ‘Let us rise and go to our fathers, and say unto them, We anathematize the Arian heresy, and we acknowledge the Nicene Council.’” J. H. N. added in a note, “He is here anticipating the return into the Church of those whom he censures. It is remarkable that what Athanasius here predicts was fulfilled to the letter, even of the worst of those ‘hypocrites.’ For Acacius himself, who in 361 signed the Anomœan Confession above recorded, was one of those very men who accepted the Homoūsion with an explanation in 363.”

<sup>6</sup> Tom. ad Antioch. see below pp. 12, 13.

<sup>7</sup> Orat. xxi. 35, 36.

than the long labours and discourses which all now commit to writing: this was more valuable than the many watchings and lying all night upon the earth; this was worthy of his celebrated banishments and flights."

Faith, Scripture says, "is the gift of God." The faith of S. Athanasius which gave rise to the proverb 'Athanasius against the world,' must have been so in an especial degree. His faith was part of himself. He did not simply believe in it as something without him. He "*knew* the truth." He had received it, as we all have.

"<sup>x</sup> Who heard' (he asks) 'in his first catechising, that God has a Son and has made all things by His proper Word, but understood it in that sense in which we now mean it?'

And having this faith, he could not but interpret Holy Scripture in conformity with it. He held the supreme authority of Holy Scripture.

"<sup>y</sup> Divine Scripture' (he says) 'is of all things most sufficient.'

"<sup>z</sup> The holy and Divine Scriptures are sufficient of themselves for the preaching of the truth.'

But Holy Scripture is always interpreted by some rule. S. Athanasius says of the Arians,

"<sup>a</sup> They allege the divine oracles and force upon them an interpretation according to their private sense.'

"<sup>b</sup> Laying down their own irreligion as a sort of canon of impiety, they wrest the whole of the divine oracles into accordance with it.'

Card. Newman observed,

"<sup>c</sup> Instead of professing to examine Scripture, or to

<sup>u</sup> 1 S. John ii. 21; 2 S. John 1.

<sup>x</sup> Orat. ii. ag. Arians c. 34. p. 328. O.T.

<sup>y</sup> ad Ep. *Æg.* § 4. Hist. Tr. p. 130. O.T. <sup>z</sup> c. *Gentes.* init.

<sup>a</sup> Orat. i. ag. Arians n. 37. p. 232. O.T. 'He who speaketh from what is his own speaketh a lie.' c. *Apoll.* i. fin. below p. 115.

<sup>b</sup> Ib. n. 52. p. 256. O.T.

<sup>c</sup> Ib. n.o.

acquiesce in what they had been taught, the Arians were remarkable for insisting on certain abstract positions or inferences, on which they made the whole controversy turn.'

And so every heretic took the opinion, which he had arbitrarily assumed, and expounded Holy Scripture by it.

'<sup>d</sup> The Scripture being of itself so deep and profound, all men do not understand it in one and the same sense, but *so many men, so many opinions* almost may be gathered out of it; for Novatian expounds it one way, Photinus in another, Sabellius in another, Donatus in another. Yet otherwise do Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius expound; otherwise Photinus, Apollinaris, Priscillianus; otherwise, lastly, Nestorius. But then it is therefore very necessary, on account of such exceeding varieties of such grievous error, that the line of Apostolic and Prophetic interpretation be guided according to the rule of the Ecclesiastical and Catholic sense.'

But the faith of S. Athanasius did not depend upon particular texts. He does not argue in our dry way. He ranges freely through Holy Scripture, as his own. He is not tied down to the passages, in which our Blessed Lord is called God; nor is our faith.

It has been spoken of, as a disadvantage to faith, that some, entrusted with an important office, have thrown a doubt upon texts which speak of our Lord as God, so that three only remain, in which, according to them, He is so spoken of<sup>e</sup>. One passage of God's word is, of course, enough for those who believe it to be the 'word of God.' But every child who has thought of its Baptism, knows that he has

<sup>d</sup> Vincent. Comm. 2. quoted Orat. ag. Arians p. 233. n. a. O. T.

<sup>e</sup> Dean Stanley 'On the revised Version of the N. T.' in *The Times*, July 20, 1881.

been baptised ‘in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,’ and he would know that he had not been baptised ‘in the Name of Almighty God and a creature and an effluence,’ although this would be strange language to him, at which, for its strangeness, he could simply stare.

Every child would answer, that when God was about to create man and said, “Let Us make man,” He was not associating the holy Angels in His own proper work of creation, but was speaking within Himself<sup>f</sup>.

No reverent child would doubt that when our Lord said, “I and My Father are One,” He spoke of a real Oneness, as even the poor Jews understood Him and accused Him of blasphemy: “Thou, being a Man, makest Thyself God.”

S. Athanasius read Holy Scripture according to his faith; but he knew also, that something more was necessary, than a mere outward rule would supply. ‘For studying and mastering the Scriptures,’ he says, ‘there is need of a good life and a pure soul<sup>g</sup>.’

The acuteness of S. Athanasius, which enabled him, while ‘not using the Post-Nestorian<sup>h</sup> or Post-Eutychian<sup>i</sup> Catholic phraseology,’ to ‘anticipate both Nestorian and Eutychian heresies<sup>k</sup>,’ was a special gift of God. But it was bestowed upon him, in addition to that eagle-sight, through another gift, his intense and reverent devotion to his Lord. He

<sup>f</sup> Petavius (quoted S. Ath. Sel. Treatises p. 120. n.q. O.T.) enumerates the Fathers who think the words addressed 1) to the Son, 2) to the Son and Holy Spirit.

<sup>g</sup> de Incarn. n. 57. <sup>h</sup> See Orat. ag. Arians p. 345, g. O. T.

<sup>i</sup> Ib. and 480. a.

<sup>k</sup> Ib. 244. b.

saw, as it were intuitively, what would affect that faith. ‘<sup>1</sup>His zeal for the Consubstantiality,’ it has been well said, ‘had its root in his loyalty to the CONSUBSTANTIAL.’ This we too can obtain. Faith must be a passion, or it will be almost lifeless. For “faith worketh by love,” and love is the strongest of human passions. “This is the victory that overcometh the world, our faith.” Of it, the words of our Lord will again be fulfilled; “The rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell not; for it was founded upon a Rock.” My own acquaintance with different forms of unbelief now dates back some 58 years, and I have known none which did not dash itself against the Rock, which is Christ, and so fall back.

For the design, and completion of the translation of these Treatises of S. Athanasius, with the careful and elaborate notes, the remaining Editor is indebted to his friend the Rev. Dr. Bright, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon of Christ Church, whose name will be a guarantee for their accuracy. To Almighty God be the thanks, Who has thus enriched our literature with eight of the later Treatises of our benefactor, S. Athanasius.

E. B. P.

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

October 21, 1881.

<sup>1</sup> Bright’s Hist. of the Church, p. 149.

## CONTENTS.

---

### TREATISE I.

The “TOME” to those at Antioch. p. 3

### TREATISE II.

The Epistle to Jovian. p. 17

### TREATISE III.

The Epistle to the African Bishops. p. 23

### TREATISE IV.

Letter to Epictetus, Bishop of Corinth. p. 45

### TREATISE V.

Letter to Adelphius. p. 61

### TREATISE VI.

Letter to Maximus, philosopher. p. 72

### TREATISE VII.

On the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, against Apollinaris.

Book i. p. 83

### TREATISE VIII.

On the Salutary appearing of Christ, and against Apollinaris.

Book ii. p. 116

## NOTE

On the "De Incarnatione et contra Arianos." p. 143

## NOTE

On the "Sermo Major de Fide." p. 145

## APPENDIX

On S. Cyril of Alexandria's interpretations of his Anathemas; and on the Dialogues of Theodoret. p. 148

## DIALOGUE I.

"Immutabilis." p. 179

## DIALOGUE II.

"Inconfusus." p. 189

## DIALOGUE III.

"Impassibilis." p. 209

LATER TREATISES  
OF  
S. ATHANASIUS,  
ARCHBISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA.

---

THE “TOME” TO THOSE AT ANTIOCH.

INTRODUCTION.

WHEN the Emperor Julian issued his decree, recalling the bishops who had been expelled from their sees by Constantius, S. Athanasius was in hiding among the monasteries of Egypt. He lost no time in returning to Alexandria, and is said to have resumed possession of his church on the 21st of February, 362. One of his first acts was to assemble about seventeen of his suffragans, in order to take counsel for the general interests of the Church, and particularly with a view to the distractions at Antioch, where the old orthodox party, which had acknowledged no bishop of Antioch since the unrighteous deposition of Eustathius in 331, stood aloof from those of their brethren in faith who, having recognized a line of Arianizing prelates without sacrificing their own convictions, now clung loyally to bishop Meletius, who, although appointed by Arianizers, had unexpectedly avowed the Catholic doctrine, had been in consequence banished, and was included in the recent amnesty. The question was, on what terms were the latter to be united to the former? Apart from the case of Antioch, it was important to arrive at an agreement as to the treatment of those many bishops who had been induced, at the Council of Ariminum or elsewhere, to accept, under ruthless pressure from the late emperor's Arianizing government, a creed which had seemed to them clear of positive heresy, but which had pointedly excluded the Nicene testing-phrase, “Homoousion,” or “of one essence with the Father,” and was in fact a specimen of “Homoean” Arianism. Moreover, among the more moderate of the Arians there had grown up a new variation of the heresy, that which was afterwards known as “Macedonianism,” and which represented the Holy Spirit as a “ministering spirit” created by the agency of the Son. Another question called for adjustment; the word Hypostasis, used by the Nicene Council in close connection with “Essence,” according to which use there could be but “one Hypostasis” in the Godhead, was being employed in a somewhat different sense by those Churchmen who had been more or less connected with the better Semi-Arians, or whose jealousy of all Sabellianizing tendencies had been intensified by the errors attributed to Marcellus, and by the

more unequivocal heterodoxy of his pupil Photinus—so that they commonly spoke of “three Hypostases,” by way of contending for a real Trinity. Lastly, two opposite movements of thought had begun to manifest themselves in reference to the mystery of the Incarnation: some were disposed to resolve it into the idea of a mere exceptional closeness of communion between the Divine Word and a holy man named Jesus: others were speaking of it in language soon to be known as Apollinarian, as if the manhood personally assumed by the Word or Son of God did not include a “reasonable soul.” The little synod now held for the consideration of these points was, says Tillemont, “an assembly of saints and confessors.” Beside the Egyptian prelates, it included Asterius of Petra in Arabia, and Eusebius, the excellent bishop of Vercelle in Northern Italy. The latter had requested a neighbour prelate of his, who, like himself, had been set free from exile, Lucifer the metropolitan of Cagliari in Sardinia, to accompany him to Alexandria. Unfortunately, as it turned out, Lucifer, a man of impatient temperament, full of zeal and courage, but deficient in judgment and forbearance, preferred to go straight to Antioch; but he sent two deacons to represent him at the synod. Paulinus, a presbyter of high character, who was at the head of the Eustathian or old Church party at Antioch, sent two delegates on his own account: and Apollinaris, the recently elected bishop of Laodicea in Syria, who was already more than suspected of holding the error now linked with his name, the denial of a reasonable soul in the Incarnate Saviour, deputed some monks to speak on his behalf. (Tillemont, vii. 612.)

Under these circumstances the Council was held: and after full discussion, the following letter, drawn up, no doubt, by its illustrious president, was adopted and sent “to those who were,” or who soon would be “at Antioch,” including Lucifer himself, two other prelates who apparently were with him, and Eusebius and Asterius, who intended to follow him. The word “Tome,” applied to the letter, was commonly used for a document relating to the doctrine or discipline of the Church, and issued by some high ecclesiastical authority. Thus we read of a “tome” sent by a Roman council to the “Easterns,” and adopted by a Council of Antioch in 378 (Theodoret v. 9.); of a “tome of the Westerns” (perhaps the same) mentioned in canon 5 of the Second General Council (ib.); of that Council’s own “tome,” (Theod. l. c.); of the “tome” of Proclus of Constantinople, addressed to the Armenians: and, more celebrated than the rest, of the “tome” of Leo the Great, otherwise called his 28th epistle, addressed to Flavian of Constantinople on the Eutychian controversy. The “tome” of the Alexandrian Council is a noble monument of pacific moderation, and of candid and comprehensive equity. See Newman’s *Arians*, c. 5, sect. 1.

## THE “TOME” TO THOSE AT ANTIOCH.

TO OUR BELOVED AND MOST DEAR FELLOW-MINISTERS  
EUSEBIUS<sup>a</sup>, LUCIFER<sup>b</sup>, ASTERIUS<sup>c</sup>, CYMATIUS<sup>d</sup> AND  
ANATOLIUS<sup>e</sup>; ATHANASIUS, AND THOSE BISHOPS FROM  
ITALY AND ARABIA, EGYPT AND LIBYA, WHO HAP-  
PENED TO BE AT ALEXANDRIA, EUSEBIUS, ASTERIUS<sup>f</sup>,  
CAIUS<sup>g</sup>, AGATHUS, AMMONIUS, AGATHODEMON, DRA-  
CONTIUS, ADELPHIUS, HERMÆON, MARCUS, ZOILUS,  
MENAS, GEORGE, LUCIUS, MACARIUS, AND THE REST,  
SEND FULLEST GREETING IN CHRIST.

<sup>a</sup> Eusebius, a Sardinian by birth, became a Reader in the Roman Church (Jerome *de Vir. Illustr.* 96:.) S. Hilary calls him a man who all through life had been serving God, *Ad Const.* i. 8. He was unanimously elected bishop of Vercellæ near Turin, in “Cisalpine Gaul,” and introduced a monastic discipline among his clergy; see Ambrose, *Epist.* 63. Tillemont, *Mem.* vii. 531. At the Council of Milan in 355, wherein the Arian party was dominant, he stood up for the Nicene faith, and was banished to Scythopolis in Palestine, where he was cruelly treated by the Arian bishop, and thence into Cappadocia, and again into Egypt. See his *Epist.* 2, in *Galland. Biblioth. Patr.* v. 79. He had now returned from exile, and was present at this Council.

<sup>b</sup> Lucifer, metropolitan of Caliaris in Sardinia, Athan. *Apol. de Fuga*. 4. Hist. Arian. 33, was associated with Eusebius in confessoryship, and suffered much at Eleutheropolis in Palestine, under the Arian bishop, before he was removed to the Thebaid. Marcellinus and Faustinus, in their “libellus,” say that he was exiled four times (Sizmond. *Op. i.* 147.) He had been writing vehement tracts against Constantius,—“A Defence of Athanasius,” “On Apostate Kings,” “We must not agree with heretics,” “We must not spare offenders against

God,” “We must die for the Son of God,” *Galland. vi.* 155. ff.

<sup>c</sup> See c. 10, where Asterius is called Bishop of Petra; and Ath. *Apol.* c. Ari. 48, “Asterius of Arabia.” There is perhaps an error in the text of Hist. Ari. 18, where a companion of his is called “bishop of Petrae in Palestine.” He went to the Council of Sardica with the Arianizers, but came over to the Catholics.

<sup>d</sup> Of Paltum in Cœlesyria, c. 10; a confessor (cf. Ath. *Hist.* Ari. 5.) who died the next year, Tillemont viii. 209.

<sup>e</sup> Of Eubœa, c. 10. Tillemont identifies him with an Anatolius of Berœa, who signed a questionable document at a Council of Antioch in 363, *Soc.* iii. 25.

<sup>f</sup> Eusebius and Asterius, although they joined in sending the letter are also here ranked with those who were to receive it, because they would be at Antioch when it was read.

<sup>g</sup> Caius (Gr. Κάιος) Agathus, Ammonius, Agathodemon, Dracontius, Adelphius, “Hermes,” Marcus, are named as exiles in Hist. Arian. 73. and all but one of them in *Apol. de Fuga* 7. For their sees and those of the rest see c. 10. Dracontius had been a monk: on being elected to a bishopric, he fled into a hiding place. Athanasius wrote to him an extant letter exhorting him to accept the

TOM. AD  
ANT. 1. We are persuaded that, as ministers of God and good stewards, you are competent to set in order all the affairs of the Church. But since it has come to our ears that many who were formerly separated from us by contentiousness now desire to be at peace, and that many also, having broken off their relations with the Arian fanatics<sup>h</sup>, aim at communion with us; we have thought it necessary to write to your Kindness what is written by ourselves and our beloved Eusebius and Asterius, who are themselves also beloved and truly dear fellow-ministers; rejoicing at such tidings, and praying that if any one is still left at a distance from us, and if any one is still seen to join with the Arians in their meetings, he may shake himself free of their madness, so that for the future all men everywhere

Eph. 4. 5. Ps. 133. 1. may say, *One Lord, one faith.* For what is so good, as the

16. Ps. 132. 15. Psalmist<sup>i</sup> said, or so pleasant, as for brethren to dwell together? Now the Church is our dwelling, and it befits us to be of the same mind; for on that condition we believe

2 Cor. 6. 16. Ps. 132. 15. that the Lord also will dwell with us. He says, *I will dwell in them and walk in them*, and, *Here will I dwell, for I have a delight therein.* But where is the "here," save where one faith and religion is preached?

2. Well, now, we of Egypt did indeed wish to go with our beloved brethren, Eusebius and Asterius, as for many reasons, so mainly for this, that we might embrace your Affectionateness<sup>k</sup>, and enjoy in common such fulness of peace and unanimity: but since, as we explained to you in our other letters, and as you can learn from our above-named fellow-ministers, we are detained by the needs of the Church, we regretted it, but still we desired our said fellow-ministers, Eusebius and Asterius, to go to you in

charge. He did so, and was exiled, with other Catholic bishops of Egypt, in 356. To Adelphius the Epistle reprinted further on was addressed, about nine years after the council. He was again exiled to Diocesarea in 373, and from thence wrote a letter to Apollinaris.

<sup>h</sup> Lit. "Ariomaniae," a term which S. Athanasius frequently applies to the Arians. So in *De Synod.* 13, *Orat.* c. *Arian.* 4, and *De Sententia Dionysii.* 27; so below, *Ep. ad Adelph.* 8.

<sup>i</sup> *Apollin. ii. 18.* See Athanasian Treatises, Lib. Fathers, vol. i. p. 91, note. Similarly he speaks of the 'madness' of Sabellius, *De Sent.* Dion. 26. Eusebius of Vercellae uses the word in his 2nd Letter; and Epiphanius says, "The Ariomaniae are the most impious of all heretics," *Ancoratus*, 118.

<sup>k</sup> Literally "the Hymn writer."

<sup>l</sup> *Δάστρα*, used in the same sense in Jovian's letter; also in Athan. *Apol. ad Const.* 6, *Ep. ad Monach.* 1.

our stead. And thanks be to their piety, that although they were free to hasten to their own dioceses<sup>1</sup>, yet on account of the urgent needs of the Church, they made it their first object to visit you. So, when they agreed to go, we consoled ourselves, because we all consider that when both you and they are there, we ourselves shall be together with you.

3. Wherefore invite to a meeting with you all who desire to be at peace with us, and especially those who assemble in the Old City<sup>m</sup>, and also those who are coming over from the Arians; and receive them as fathers would receive sons, and welcome them as teachers and guardians might do: and unite them to our dear friends, Paulinus and those with him, and demand nothing more from them than that they anathematize the Arian heresy, and confess the faith confessed by the holy fathers at Nicaea, and moreover anathematize those who say that the Holy Spirit is a creature and is separated from the essence of Christ<sup>n</sup>: for there is no real abandonment of the abhorred heresy

<sup>1</sup> Παροικίας, in the ancient sense of “the church dwelling in a particular area under the oversight of a bishop,” i.e. a diocesan church or diocese: as in the Ep. of Ch. of Smyrna on S. Polycarp’s death, Euseb. iv. 15. &c.

<sup>m</sup> Ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ. In the “Old Town” of Antioch, stretching along the bank of the Orontes, and regarded as a suburb—where was a Church called the “Apostles”, in which the adherents of bishop Meletius held their services, Theodoret ii. 31, while the presbyter Paulinus was allowed by the Arian bishop Euzoius, out of respect for his high character, to assemble his “Eustathians”, or Old Church congregation, in a small church in the New City, on the island, Soe. iii. 9. It is clear that the Council regards the Eustathians, with whom Athanasius had worshipped when at Antioch in 346, as in their rights; it is to the adherents of Meletius that the invitation is to be addressed to come and join the Eustathians in their place of meeting, on certain terms herein prescribed. See c. 9.

<sup>n</sup> This was the heresy called Macedonian, after the Semi-Arian bishop Macedonius. It was an offshoot of

the Arian. Soe. ii. 45. Soz. iv. 27. Theod. ii. 6. It arose out of a refusal to extend the Homoiouion from the Son to the Holy Spirit: see Swete’s Early History of Doctrine of Holy Spirit, p. 51. It was in fact a “survival” of the Arian idea as applied to the Holy Spirit: see Athan. Orat. c. Ari. iii. 15, cf. Epist. ad Serap. i. 2, 9, 32: S. Basil de Spir. Sanet. 16—18: S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 31: Epiphanius, Haer. 74. Among the protests against it, see the magnificent “invocation” of the Holy Spirit, in the Liturgy of S. Mark. Hammond’s Liturgies Eastern and Western, p. 187, also Damasus’s formulary addressed to Paulinus, Theod. v. 11, insisting that the Holy Spirit is almighty, omniscient, omnipresent, an agent in creation, one in Godhead, power, glory, will, with the Father and the Son, and with them adorable. The phrase “Lord and Life-giver,” added in the “Constantinopolitan” form of the Nicene Creed, contradicts the “Macedonian” assertion that the Holy Spirit was a created being, differing in nature from the angels: as the words affirming His adorableness impress the idea of His co-equality.

TOM. AD ANT. of the Arians, so long as we make a division in the Holy Trinity<sup>6</sup>, and say that any member of It is a creature. For those who pretend to acknowledge the faith confessed at Nicaea, but dare to blaspheme against the Holy Spirit<sup>7</sup>, are simply denying the Arian heresy in words, but retaining it in thought. And let the impiety of Sabellius<sup>8</sup> and Paul of Samosata<sup>9</sup>, and the madness of Valentinus and Basilides, and the insanity of the Manicheans, be anathematized by all. For when this is done, every one will be cleared of all evil suspicion, and the Catholic Church's faith will alone be exhibited in its purity.

4. Now we do not suppose any of you, or any one else, to be ignorant of the fact that this is the faith which is held by us, and by those who have been always in communion with us. But, since we rejoice with those who desire to be united to us,—with all, but principally with those who assemble in the Old City, and have glorified the Lord, as for all things, so above all for their good purpose; we exhort you to let their union take place on these terms, and that nothing beyond this, as we said above, should be demanded by you from those who assemble in the Old City; and that Paulinus and his people should propose nothing different from, nor going beyond, the decisions of Nicaea.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Athan. Ep. ad Serap. iv. 12. “For the holy and blessed and perfect Trinity is undivided.” So Orat. c. Arian. i. 18. “The faith of Christians knows the blessed Trinity to be unchangeable and perfect and ever existing in the same way.”

<sup>7</sup> In Ep. ad Serap. iv. 18, he explains “blasphemy against the Holy Spirit” to mean the denial of Christ’s true Divinity. Here he takes a simpler view. Damasus’s formulare sent to Paulinus describes the Macedonians as “issuing from the root of Arian, and having changed the name but not the impiety.” Theod. v. 11. In this sentence ὀγομάζειν is used for “to acknowledge” or “treat as authoritative,” cf. Ad Afros. I, 3, 4.

<sup>8</sup> Sabellius, a Lybian, in the early part of the third century, taught that the “Son” and “Spirit” were mere phases or aspects of the one Person of the Father.

<sup>9</sup> The heresy of Paul of Samosata,

reduced to few words, was this; “Jesus is not God, but a man who through eminent sanctity won the title of Son of God. The Word is not personal, but is the Divine attribute of Wisdom, which dwelt with special fulness in Jesus.” Paul was bishop of Antioch, and was condemned by the Council of Antioch, in 269. See some words of his quoted in Routh’s Reliq. Sacr. iii. 300, that the Word *σερήνθετερ* with Jesus Christ miraculously, and that Wisdom dwelt in Him as it did not in others, “for it was in the Prophets, but yet more in Moses; and in many was the Lord, but yet more in Christ as in a temple: for Jesus Christ is one, and the Word is another.” So he is said to have held that the indwelling of the Divine Wisdom in Jesus excelled its indwelling in others. “μετρω τε καλ πλήθει,—say, twice as much.” Routh, Reli. iii. 311.

5. And, for instance, as for the document<sup>s</sup> which some talk of as if it had been compiled in the Council of Sardica, concerning faith, do not allow it to be so much as read or brought forward; for the Synod defined nothing of the sort. For some indeed requested that some definite formula should be drawn up, as if the Nicene Creed were defective; and indeed rashly attempted this<sup>t</sup>. But the holy council assembled at Sardica was indignant, and decreed that no new formulary about the faith should be drawn up, but the faith confessed at Nicæa by the fathers should be deemed sufficient, because nothing was lacking to it, but on the contrary, it was full of true religion; and that no second creed<sup>u</sup> should be put forth, lest that which was written at Nicæa should be regarded as incomplete, and an occasion should be given to those who desired to be often drawing up formularies and definitions about faith. Wherefore if any one brings forward this, or a different formulary, put a stop to such persons' conduct, and advise them rather to study peace, for we discern nothing in them save contentiousness. For as regards the persons whom some began to censure for affirming "Three Hypostases<sup>x</sup>," because the phrase was not found in Scripture, and

<sup>s</sup> Literally, a leaf out of a writing tablet.

<sup>t</sup> The doctrinal formulary annexed to the Synodal letter in Theodoret ii. 8. and of which a Latin translation was discovered by Maffei in the Cathedral library of Verona (Mansi, vi. 1215) was probably a draft of an explanatory formula such as Sozomen refers to, iii. 12, but which the council did not in fact accept, see Hefele, Hist. Councils, sect. 63.

<sup>u</sup> Πίστιν, here used for a formulary of faith, so S. Basil, Ep. 81, "Hermogenes, who wrote the great and impregnable πίστιν in the great council;" so the council of Constantinople in 381, can. 1; so Gregory of Nazianzus, Epist. 102: so Socrates ii. 45, "they read the same πίστιν which they had also read at Constantinople" &c. In this sense also the word was used in the famous prohibitory decree called the seventh canon of Ephesus: no one is "to present, or write, or compose any different πίστιν from that which was framed by the Nicene fa-

thers." The word ἐκτίθεσθαι, put forward, may be illustrated by the use of Ethesis for a doctrinal formulary, e.g. that of Heraclius. Compare Theod. v. 9, "the tome which was put forth" (ἐκτεθέντι.)

<sup>x</sup> This famous word was originally used for sediment or deposit, Soc. iii. 7. Thus it came to mean (2) substratum or basis. In 2 Cor 9. 4, it is used for "well-grounded confidence;" and (3) "substance" or reality, as Heb. 11. 1. faith is called the hypostasis of things hoped for, i. e. the process which gives them a real existence in our minds. So Tatian called God the hypostasis of all beings, ad Graecos 5: and the hypostasis of God meant His real existence, Himself as a true Being, as it had been used in Heb. 1. 3: cp. LXX. Ps. 88. 47. Hence, (4) as in the Nicene anathema, and generally by Athanasius, (e. 9. Orat. e. Ari. iii. 65. e. Apollin. i. 12, ad Afros, 4,) it was used as equivalent to οὐσία, essence. But the Divine essence was one: therefore there was but one Divine hypostasis.

**TOM. AD ANT.** was consequently open to suspicion, we requested them not to seek for anything more than the Nicene confession ; but nevertheless, on account of this contentiousness, we inquired of them whether, like the Arian fanatics, they meant to speak of “Hypostases” alien and foreign to each other, and differing from each other in essence, and each by itself an independent<sup>y</sup> “Hypostasis,” as are those other beings, the creatures and the offspring of men ; or like different essences, such as gold, silver, or brass ; or whether, in speaking of “Three Hypostases,” they had the same notion as other heresies had in speaking of three Principles or three Gods. They positively declared that they neither said this, nor had ever thought it. Thereupon we asked them, “Why then do you say Three Hypostases? or why do you use such phrases at all?” They replied, “Because we believe in the Holy Trinity : we know of a Trinity not in name only, but truly existing and subsisting, a Father truly existing and subsisting, and a Son truly existing<sup>z</sup> and subsisting, and a Holy Spirit subsisting and existing : we have neither said ‘Three Gods’ nor ‘Three Principles,’

Yet, since the distinction between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, was real, it was not unnatural, by giving a slight turn to the word, to apply it to the Divine essence as existing in each of the Three Persons, (as we call them for want of a more fitting term,) as much as to say, “In the Unity there is a real Trinity ; the Father is really the Father, the Son really the Son, the Spirit really the Spirit ;” as the third creed of Antioch said that the Son was with God “in a hypostasis ;” Ath. de Syn. 21 : and hence arose the phrase “Three Hypostases,” which was startling as apparently inconsistent with the truth of the Divine Unity of essence, and as having been used by Arius, Ath. de Synodis 16. But as we see, a little patient questioning and frank explanation brought these two classes of Catholics to understand each other. Card. Newman considers “three hypostases” to be a somewhat lax or inaccurate expression of the truth that each of the Divine Three is the One God in this or that form of Divine personality. Tracts Theod. and Eccles. p. 391 : Arians, ed. 3,

p. 449. Comp. Athan. Treatises ii. 424. Later on, S. Basil expressly (followed by Theodoret, in his Dialogues) distinguished hypostasis from *οὐραί* as the specific from the general, Ep. 28. The letter of Valentinian I. to the Asiaties in 375 uses hypostases as = *πρόσωπα*, Theod. iv. 8. and so in 430, Cyril Alex. anath. 4. On the senses of *ὑπόστασις* see Dean Liddell's Sermon on “Where two or three,” p. 32.

<sup>y</sup> Literally, “separated, by itself.” Probably he was thinking of Dionysius of Rome, who in the third century had condemned the Tritheistic notion of three hypostases foreign to each other, and separate, ap. Athan. de Deir. Nic. 26. The 19th verse of the “Quicunque Vult” should be rendered, “to acknowledge each Person severally as God,” &c. not “by Himself.”

<sup>z</sup> Comp. Athanasius, Ep. ad Serap. i. 28. “There is a Trinity, not merely in name and in a figure of speech, but a Trinity real and existent,” or as we might express it, “immanent,” Liddon's Bamp. Lect. p. 16.

nor could we at all endure those who say or think thus: but we know a Holy Trinity, and one Godhead, and one Principle<sup>a</sup>, and a Son coessential with the Father, as the fathers said, and the Holy Spirit, not a creature, nor foreign to, but belonging to, and undivided from, the essence of the Son and of the Father."

6. We accepted their interpretation of their language, and their defence of it; and proceeded to enquire of those whom they had blamed for saying "One Hypostasis," whether they said so in the sense of Sabellius,<sup>b</sup> by way of doing away with the Son and the Holy Spirit, or as if the Son were without true being, and the Holy Spirit without subsistence<sup>c</sup>. And they also positively declared that they did not say so. "But," they said, "we speak of Hypostasis, considering hypostasis and essence to mean the same thing: and we hold One Hypostasis, because the Son is from the Father's essence, and because of the sameness of the nature; for we believe the Godhead to be one, and its nature to be one, and not that the Father's is one, and

<sup>a</sup> This one "principle" (*ἀρχή*) would be the Father (as Fountain of Godhead, cf. Ath. de Decr. Nic. 15.) So Orat. c. Ari. iv. 1. "that the Word is referred to the Father, whose Son He is,, so that while Father and Son are two, we speak of one 'principle,' not two: whence there is properly a Unity of Principle or Origin," (*μοναρχία*.) and note there (Ath. Treat. ii. 513, and i. 45.) So Theodore, *περὶ ἀρχῆς καὶ Πατρός*, Hær. Fab. v. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. c. Apollin. ii. 3.

<sup>c</sup> 'Ανονοίου . . . . . ἀνυποστάτου. Here *οὐσία* itself is used, implicitly, in a personal sense, as in Hippolytus c. Noet. 7, 4. cf. Origen in Joan. tom. 2. 18. Athanasius speaks of the Word as not "unsubsistent," *ἀνυπόστατον*, but subsistent, *ἐνούσιον*, de Synodis 42; Orat. c. Ari. iv. 2. and uses *ἀνυπόστατον* for the Son as conceived of by Sabellius, i. e. impersonal, c. Apollin. i. 21. This is very like using both *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* for 'existence in personality.' See Card. Newman, Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 305. The Semi-Arian Basil of Ancyra and his friends, quoted in Epiphanius, Hær. 73. 12, used the phrase "the Son has

hypostasis" "for, the Son really exists, is not a mere spoken word." (So the Macrostich creed had condemned the Marcellian idea of a Son unsubstantiating, *ἀνύπαρκτον*, Ath. de Syn. 26.) Epiphanius speaks of each Person as *ἐνυπόστατος*, Ancor. 6; and says he thinks that the human mind is not, as the Apollinarians held, a hypostasis, but "an energy," whereas Christ is a "hypostasis," Hær. 77. 24. Compare Cyril Alex. de recta fide ad Theod. 13, on the Paulianist heresy of an "unsubsisting" Word, which was not hypostatic, but only "uttered by God." He argues that if the image of God be not hypostatic, God Himself is not hypostatic. He uses *ἀνυπόστατον* as equivalent to *ἀνύπαρκτον*, to *οὐκ ὄντα*, to what has not received existence. So ib. 24, He did not come as a *λόγος ἀνυπόστατος*. So the six bishops writing to Paul of Samosata: "By whom the Father made all things, not as *δι ἐπιστήμης ἀνυποστάτου*." Compare Newman, Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 323, as to the sense of Malchion's words, that Paul of Samosata denied the Son *οὐσιῶσθαι* in the whole Saviour: Routh, Rell. Saer. iii. 302.

<sup>TOM. AD</sup> that the Son's and the Holy Spirit's are foreign to Him<sup>a</sup>.  
<sup>ANT.</sup> Thereupon too, of course, those who had been blamed for saying "Three Hypostases" agreed with the former, and those also who said "One Essence"<sup>b</sup> admitted the language of the others, as they explained it. And both parties anathematized Arius as one who fought against Christ, and Sabellius and Paul of Samosata as impious men, and Valentinus and Basilides<sup>c</sup> as alien from the truth, and Manes as an inventor of evil: and all, by God's grace, after the above mentioned explanations, agreed with us that the faith confessed at Nicæa by the fathers was better and more accurate than such phrases, and that for the future they would rather be content with and use its terms<sup>d</sup>.

7. But further in regard to the economy<sup>e</sup> of our Saviour in the flesh, since some seemed to be contentious with each other on that point also, we examined both parties, and what one party professed the other agreed to, that the Word of the Lord did not sojourn in a holy man<sup>f</sup> at the

<sup>a</sup> See Neale's lively description of this examination of the two parties, in his *Hist. Alex.* i. 194. Gregory Nazianzen says, "He addressed both parties with gentleness and kindness, carefully examined the meaning of their words, and found that they did not differ as to doctrine." This peace-making temper, he proceeds, was more beneficial than all Athanasius's long labours, writings, exiles, *Orat.* 21, 35, 36. See Stanley on Eastern Church, p. 300. It was characteristic of Athanasius as a theologian to look through words into meanings, as in his address to the Semi-Arians on the Homousion, *de Synod.* 41.

<sup>b</sup> Οὐσία here seems to be an error for ὑπόστασιν.

<sup>c</sup> For Basilides and Valentinus see Mansel's *Gnostic Heresies*, pp. 144, 184.

<sup>d</sup> Yet the anathema attached to the creed did implicitly sanction "one hypostasis," by using hypostasis as = οὐσία. Gregory says that Athanasius allowed to each party the use of its own phrase. Socrates makes a strange mistake, imagining that this Council prohibited the use of οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, *iii.* 7, as if it had followed in the track of the Acacian Arians,—see their creed as completed

at Nicæa in Thrace and imposed at Ariminum, Athan. *de Synod.* 30. Sozomen corrects Socrates, *v.* 12.

<sup>e</sup> Οἰκονομία used for the dispensation whereby the Son of God condescended to become Man; the original Divinity of His Person being expressed by the term θεολογία. So Eusebius *i.* 1. οἰκονομός τε καὶ θεολογία. S. Basil, *Ep.* 8. 3. ἵνα μὴ . . . τῷ θεολογίᾳ προτεχούτε, τῆς οἰκονομίας καταφρονῶμεν. On this sense of οἰκονομία see Newman's *Arians*, p. 76; and comp. Ath. *c.* Apollin. *i.* 2; 18. *Orat. c.* Arian. *ii.* 9, "the Word's economy in regard to Manhood." So Cyril Alex. *de Recta fide ad Theod.* *c.* 37. (ed. Pusey, p. 122,) τῷ μετὰ σαρκὸς οἰκονομίᾳ.

<sup>f</sup> See *Ep. ad Epictet.* 2. *ad Maxim.* 2. *c.* Apollin. *i.* 21. *Orat. c.* Arian. *iii.* 1, "Nor is God in the Son as by coming into the Saints," &c. and *ib.* *iii.* 30. We gather from a passage in S. Hilary, *de Trin.* *x.* 21, that this notion that the Word of God was in Jesus as the spirit of prophecy was in the prophets, was held by the Photinians, in whose view the Word was impersonal or non-subsistent, and Jesus was a mere man in whom the Word dwelt with special fulness: and that they charged the Catholics with denying that our Lord was born with

consummation of the ages, just as He *came to the prophets*, <sup>E.g. Jer.</sup> but that the Word Himself became flesh, and, *existing in* <sup>1. 2. etc.</sup> *the form of God*, took the *form of a servant*, and was born <sup>Phil. 2.</sup> *6, 7.*

Man, of Mary, according to the flesh, for our sakes ; and that thus the human race being through Him perfectly and entirely delivered from sin, and endued with life from the dead, was introduced into the kingdom of heaven. For they also acknowledged this, that the Saviour had not a body without a soul, nor without perception, nor without a mind<sup>k</sup>, for neither was it possible that, when the Lord became Man for us, His body should be without a mind ; nor was it body only, but soul also that attained salvation in the Word Himself and being truly Son of God, He, the same, became also *firstborn among many brethren*. Therefore, the Son of God who *was before Abraham* was not one, and He who was after Abraham another<sup>1</sup> ; nor was He who raised up Lazarus one, and He who enquired about him another : but it was the same who said humanly, *Where is* <sup>Rom. 8. 29.</sup> *S. John 8. 58.*

<sup>11. 34.</sup>

soul and body. Apollinaris was rightly zealous against the notion described in the text ; and his envoys apparently drew forth a disclaimer of it from those to whom they gave, in his name, an assurance as to his teaching about the soul in Christ. The disclaimer was in effect, “We on our parts assure you that we have no sort of sympathy with the Photinian view of Christ’s Person.” See Apollinaris’s words in a letter of A.D. 377, quoted by Leontius, Galland, xii. 706, that the Word which was in the Prophets did not (in the case of Christ) come into a holy man, but the Word Himself became flesh ; and his disciple Timothy objected to a brother-Apollinarian of the moderate school for saying that the flesh was not made co-essential with the Godhead, but only united to it ; “as a holy man,” he comments, “might be united to God ;” ib. xii. 704. Epiphanius, in his paraphrase of the creed, says that the Son became man, not as if dwelling in a man, nor as when He inspired the prophets and acted by them, Ancorat. 121 ; and see below, Ep. Epict. 11. Gregory Nazianzen, while attacking Apollinarianism, strongly condemns this notion that the Word acted by grace in Jesus, as

in a prophet, Epist. 101. One of the strongest points taken by S. Cyril was that Nestorianism virtually represented the relation between the Word and the Christ as the same in kind, though not in degree, with the relation between that Word and the saints, e. g. Ep. ad Nest. 2. 10, Explan. 3. &c.

<sup>k</sup> That this admission was equivocal, may be inferred from Apollinaris’s letter, above quoted, “He took not a human mind, but a Divine mind. Wherefore the Saviour had not a body devoid of . . . intelligence ;” i. e. His *νοῦς* was in fact His Godhead. So Vitalis at first delighted his hearers by owning Christ to be “perfect man ;” but it turned out that he substituted Godhead for mind, Epiph. Haer. 77, 23. So Greg. Naz. says that the Apollinarians would acknowledge Christ to be not without a *νοῦς* or *λόγος*, secretly meaning thereby His Godhead. Ep. 102. Compare Ath. c. Apollin. c. ii. 10.

<sup>1</sup> So Apollinaris says, in the same letter: “There was not one Son of God before Abraham, and another after Abraham.” This, of course, is most true, as S. Cyril says, ad Nest. iii. 3. “who was Divinely before Abraham, and afterwards became Man.”

**TOM. AD** *Lazarus laid?* and who divinely raised him up<sup>m</sup>. It was the same who spat corporeally as Man, but Divinely, as Son of God, opened the eyes of the man born blind, who suffered in flesh, as Peter said<sup>n</sup>, but Divinely opened the tombs and raised up the dead. On account of which texts they understood all the contents of the Gospel in this sense, and positively declared that they were of the same mind regarding the Incarnation of the Word, and His becoming Man.

**ANT.**  
**S. John**  
**9. 6.**  
**I S. Pet.**  
**4. 1**

8. Since therefore these points have been thus acknowledged, we exhort you not to condemn rashly, nor reject, those who make a like acknowledgement, and thus interpret the phrases which they used, but rather to welcome them, now that they make for peace, and excuse themselves: but as for those who do not choose to make this acknowledgement, and thus to interpret the phrases, keep them at a distance and put them to shame, as persons whose opinions are suspected. And while you shew no tolerance to these latter, advise the former, whose explanations and sentiments are correct, not to examine each other any further, nor to keep up a strife of words, nor to use such phrases as these in dispute with each other, but to be united in the sentiments of true religion<sup>o</sup>. For those that are not so disposed, but are contentious merely about such little phrases<sup>p</sup>, and seek for something beyond what was formulated at Nicæa, are simply *giving their neighbours to drink*

**Hab. 2.**  
**15. LXX.**

<sup>m</sup> See Ep. ad Max. 3; and so Orat. e. Arian. iii. 32. "He uttered a human voice as man, but as God He raised Lazarus from the dead." Also de Sentent. Dionysii, 9, "The Lord having become Man shewed that He could weep as man but raised up Lazarus as God." Comp. S. Leo the Great's Tome or Ep. 28, e. 4, that it did not belong to the same nature to weep over a friend as dead, and to raise him up as restored to life, although these were the acts of one Person, &c.

<sup>n</sup> On this text see Athan. Orat. iii. 31. Cyril cites it in Ep. ad Nest. 2, 6. (Pusey, p. 24.) "We confess that He who was begotten of God the Father, as Son and God Only begotten, did

himself suffer in flesh for us according to the Scriptures, although He was in His own nature impassible." And in his Letter to John of Antioch (Pusey, p. 50) he again cites it, adding, "and not in the nature of the ineffable God-head."

<sup>o</sup> Ἐὐρεβέλας, in the Athanasian sense of "orthodox Christianity," the right or sound belief in God, with the devotion and obedience involved in it. This sense was derived from 1 Tim. 3, 16. See Newman's Arians, p. 286.

<sup>p</sup> Αργεῖδιος. The word occurs in Orat. e. Ari. ii. 5, 11.

<sup>q</sup> This text is similarly quoted in ad Epict. 1; e. Apollin. ii. 4.

peace and love schisms. But do you, as good men, and faithful servants, and stewards of the Lord, put a stop to, and keep off, all things that give scandal and are strange, and set before every other consideration such a peace as this, the faith being in a sound state<sup>r</sup>. Perhaps the Lord will have mercy on us, and join together the parts that have been divided; and when there is made one fold, we shall all again have one Guide, our Lord Jesus Christ.

9. For ourselves, although it was not necessary to seek for anything beyond the Nicene Creed<sup>s</sup>, nor to tolerate the words that grow out of contentiousness, yet still for peace' sake, and in order not to drive away those who wished to believe rightly, we went into these enquiries: and what the parties have acknowledged we have dictated in concise form, we who have been left in Alexandria, together with our fellow ministers Asterius and Eusebius, for the majority of us have departed to their own dioceses. But do you, in public, in your accustomed place of meeting, read this, and be pleased to invite all to meet you there. For it is right that this letter should first be read there, and that those who wish and who labour for peace should be joined together there, and that afterwards, when they have been joined together, the Church-meetings<sup>t</sup> should be held, and the Lord be glorified by all in common, in whatever place is agreeable to all the people, your Kindness being present. The brethren who are with me greet you. I, Athanasius, pray that you may be in good health, and may remember me before the Lord. And likewise the other bishops who came together have signed their names, and so did those who were sent by Lucifer, bishop of the isle of Sardinia, being two deacons, Herennius and

<sup>r</sup> I.e. since the parties in question are substantially agreed as to the faith. The zeal against "logomachy," in this passage, is characteristic of Athanasius; see *Ad Jovian.* 4. *ad Max.* 1.

<sup>s</sup> See *Ad Afros.* 1.

<sup>t</sup> Συνάξεις, assemblies for worship. So in *Apol. ad Const.* 25, *de Fuga*, 24, a vigil in preparation for συνάξεως. So *Apol. ad Const.* 4. "I spent my time at (Rome) ταῖς συνάξεσι, cf. ib. 15. σύναξις." So συνάξω is to hold a

service, *Euseb.* vii. 11, *Athan. Apol. c. Ari.* 20, and συνάγομαι, to join in a service, to have a place in the congregation, *Athan. Apol. c.* 12. *Ep. de morte Arii.* 2. In the "exceptiones" wrongly ascribed (see *Haddan and Stubbs, Councils and Eccl. Docm.* iii. 415) to Egbert archbishop of York, no. 28 (*Wilkins, Concil.* i. 103) we find "synaxes" used for the offices of the seven canonical hours.

<sup>TON. AD</sup> Agapetus, and those sent by Paulinus, Maximus and Calemerus, being themselves also deacons. And there were also present some monks of Apollinaris the bishop, sent by him for this purpose <sup>u</sup>.

10. Now the above named bishops, to whom the letter was written, are Eusebius, of the city of Vercellæ in Gaul, Lucifer of the island of Sardinia, Asterius of Petra in Arabia, Cymatius of Paltum in Cœlesyria, Anatolius of Eubœa. And those who wrote the letter are the Pope <sup>x</sup> Athanasius, and those who were with him in Alexandria, and Eusebius himself, and Asterius: and the rest, Caius of Parætonium, near to Libya <sup>y</sup>; Agathus of Phragonis <sup>z</sup> and of a part of Elearchia in Egypt; Ammonius of Pachnemunis and of the other part of Elearchia; Agathodæmon, of Schedia and Menilaites <sup>a</sup>; Dracontius, of Little Hermopolis <sup>b</sup>; Adelphius, of Onuphis <sup>c</sup> in Lychna; Hermion, of Tanis <sup>d</sup>; Mark, of Zygra near to Libya; Theodore, of Athribis <sup>e</sup>; Andrew <sup>f</sup>, of Arsenois <sup>g</sup>; Paphnutius, of Sais; Mark, of Philæ <sup>h</sup>; Zoilus, of Andro; Menas, of Antiphra.

To this Eusebius added his signature thus in Latin, of which the following is a translation :

1. Eusebius, bishop, according to your accurate profession of doctrine made by both parties, when you agreed together on the subject of the Hypostases, did also agree; and moreover concerning the Incarnation of our Saviour, that the Son of God became also Man, having assumed all

<sup>u</sup> I. e. sent to disclaim the opinions imputed to him as to the "mind" in Christ.

<sup>x</sup> The title "Papas" or "dear father" was specially given in the East, to the Bishop of Alexandria: thus Arius and his friends wrote to "Alexander their blessed pope and bishop," Athan. de Synod. 16: George of Laodicea called him Alexander the pope, ib. 17: and so Athanasius speaks of him, Apol. c. Arian. 71. Ischyras writes to "the blessed pope Athanasius," ib. 63. Compare Eusebius vii. 7, where Dionysius of Alex. calls his predecessor, "our blessed pope."

<sup>y</sup> This place is mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria in Euseb. vii. 11. It was on the coast of Libya Marma-

rica, as were Zygra and Antiphra.

<sup>z</sup> Phragonis, Pachnemunis, Elearchia, were in Egyptus Secunda in extreme N. of Egypt.

<sup>a</sup> Somewhat to N. E. of Alexandria.

<sup>b</sup> S. E. of Alexandria.

<sup>c</sup> In Egyptus Prima, as were Sais and Andropolis.

<sup>d</sup> In Augstantinica Prima.

<sup>e</sup> In Augstantinica Secunda. Comp. Soc. v. 10.

<sup>f</sup> Named with Paphnutius in Athanasius's 19th Festal Epistle.

<sup>g</sup> In "Arcadia" or Heptanomis.

<sup>h</sup> In the southern or second Thebaid. It will be seen that, of the Egyptian suffragans here assembled, some belonged to dioceses far apart.

without sin, even as our original<sup>i</sup> man subsisted, I have guaranteed my belief according to the context of the letter. And whereas “the document of Sardica” is said to be excluded in order that nothing might seem to be put forth beside the Nicene faith, I also assent, that the Nicene faith may not seem to be shut out by means of it: nor ought it to be brought forward. I pray that you may be in health in the Lord.

I, Asterius, assent to the above written, and pray that you may be in health in the Lord.

And after this Tome had been sent from Alexandria, thus signed by the above named, they also (at Antioch) afterwards added their own signatures as follows:

I, Paulinus,<sup>k</sup> think thus, as I received from the fathers: that the Father exists, and subsists perfectly, and a perfect Son subsists perfectly, and the Holy Spirit subsists perfectly. Wherefore I approve of the above explanation concerning the Three Hypostases, and the One Hypostasis or Essence, and those who think thus. For it is pious to think of and confess the Holy Trinity in One Godhead<sup>1</sup>. And also concerning the Incarnation of the Word of the Father, which took place for our sakes, I think thus as it is written, that according to John, *the Word became flesh*:

S. John  
1. 14.

<sup>i</sup> Literally “old,” i.e. as Adam was created.

<sup>k</sup> Paulinus, apparently, had been suspected either of Sabellianism or of what was afterwards called Apollinarism, (charges to which, as a Catholic of the most anti-Arian type, he might be thought open;) and he vindicated himself by this document, which is also given by Epiphanius, who says it was written out by Athanasius's own hand, *Haer.* 77. 20, 21. See Tillemont, viii. 221, who says this took place in the reign of Jovian, when Athanasius visited Antioch a year after the Alexandrian Council, i.e. after Paulinus had received episcopal consecration from the impatient Lucifer, who thus rendered pacification hopeless. It is observable that Vitalis, about fourteen years later, told Epiphanius that Paulinus held Sabellianism; whereupon Paulinus produced

this paper, and said in his turn that Vitalis denied that Christ became perfect man. Theodoret's story in v. 3, that Flavian in 380 publicly taxed Paulinus with denying the “Trinity of Hypostases,” although professing to communicate with Damasus who admitted it, is very reasonably set aside by Tillemont, viii. 767. Theodoret had a bias against Paulinus.

<sup>1</sup> I.e. so to hold the Unity of the Godhead as not to compromise Trinitarianism; to “worship one God,” but as “in Trinity.” So Ep. Epict. 9. Orat. c. Arian. iii. 15; “Then also do we confess God to be One, through the Trinity;” and ib. i. 18, “an eternal and one Godhead exists in Trinity.” So Epiphanius, Auctorat. 7, “The Trinity is always a Trinity . . . In the Trinity there is no blending together, and no separation from its proper Unity.”

TOM. AD underwent a change<sup>m</sup>, but that He became Man for us, being born of the Holy Virgin Mary and the Holy Spirit. For the Saviour had not a body without soul, nor without perception, nor without mind: for it was not possible that, when the Lord became Man for us, His body should be without a mind. Wherefore I anathematize those who set aside the faith confessed at Nicæa, and who do not say that the Son is from the essence of the Father and is co-essential with Him. And I anathematize those who say that the Holy Spirit is a creature, brought into existence by means of the Son. And further, I anathematize the heresy of Photinus<sup>n</sup>, and every heresy; walking in the path of<sup>o</sup> the Nicene faith and of what is above written. I, Carterius, pray that you may be in good health.

<sup>m</sup> According to the second proposition of the Apollinarian school, which Apollinaris himself disclaimed, but which was thus early affirmed by some of his friends or pupils,—that the Lord's body was formed by a 'conversion of Godhead into flesh.' Some persons had asserted it about 350, for it is condemned by the "first Sirmian" confession in 351, Athan. de Synod. 27.

<sup>n</sup> Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, appears to have imbibed from Marcellus a theory akin to Sabellianism, and, in advocating it, had emphasized that aspect of Sabellianism which involved a merely humanitarian view of the Person of Christ, Soc. ii. 18. In his view our Lord had had no existence before His Nativity. He was censured in the Semi-Arian "Macrostich" confes-

sion of 341, condemned in councils at Milan in 345, and 347, again at an Arianizing council of Sirmium in 347—8, and finally condemned by the second or great council of Sirmium in 351 (its doctrinal formulary is given by Athanasius de Synodis, 27; comp. Hilary de Synodis 38, Fragm. 2. 19, 21.) Photinus was then ejected and exiled, Soc. ii. 30: but he is said to have been recalled under Julian, and again exiled under Valentinian I. He retained his opinions until his death. Athanasius alludes to him as denying the Divinity of Christ, e. Apollin. ii. 19; and Hilary de Trin. vii. 7, 19, and the formulary sent by Damasus to Paulinus, Theod. v. 11, accuse him of reviving Ebionism.

<sup>o</sup> Στοιχῶν, cf. Rom. 4. 12.

## THE EPISTLE TO JOVIAN.

### INTRODUCTION.

JOVIAN, on succeeding to the empire in the summer of 363, at once showed himself favourable to the orthodox bishops. He sent to Athanasius the letter following, and shortly afterwards, as it would appear from Athanasius's letter, wrote to him again asking for a compendious account of the Catholic doctrine. It should be remembered to the honour of this prince, that his straightforward orthodoxy was united, according to the testimony of a Pagan philosopher, with a spirit of comprehensive toleration <sup>a</sup>.

### [THE EPISTLE OF JOVIAN.

JOVIAN, TO THE MOST RELIGIOUS ATHANASIUS, A FRIEND  
OF GOD.

HIGHLY admiring the excellences of your most virtuous life, and of your likemindedness to the God of the universe, and of your affections towards our Saviour Christ, we praise you, most honoured Bishop, because you have not quailed at any labour, nor at the terror caused by the persecutors; and esteeming dangers and threats of the world as dung, grasping the rudder of that orthodox faith which is dear to you, you have contended even until now for the truth, and continue to exhibit yourself as an example and pattern of virtue to the whole community of the faithful. Our Majesty, therefore, recalls you, and wills you to return to the teaching of the way of salvation. Return, then, to the holy churches, and act as the friend of God's people, and send up earnest prayers for our Clemency. For we know that by your supplication both we and those with us who are of Christian sentiments will receive great assistance from the Most High God.]

## THE LETTER OF ATHANASIUS TO JOVIAN <sup>b</sup>.

1. A DESIRE of instruction, and a longing after heavenly things, are becoming to a religious Emperor; for by this

<sup>a</sup> Soc. iii. 25. Themistius, Orat. 5. (Op. p. 50, ed. Harduin.) Compare Athanasius's own maximus, e.g. Hist. Ari. 33, 67.

<sup>b</sup> Theodoret inserts this letter in his History, iii. 3, with this heading. "Athanasius and the other bishops who have come as representatives of

**E.P. AD Jov.** means will you have your *heart* truly *in the hand of God* <sup>c</sup>.  
**Prov. 21. 1.** Since then your Piety has wished to learn from us the faith of the Catholic Church, we give thanks on this account to the Lord, and have thought fit to remind your Piety of the faith confessed by the fathers at Nicaea, rather than of anything else. For some, who had set this faith aside, laid various plots against us, because we did not give way to the Arian heresy; and they have become the authors of heresy and schisms against the Catholic Church. For the true and pious faith in the Lord is made plain to all men, being both known and read from the Holy Scriptures <sup>d</sup>. For in this faith the saints were made perfect and suffered martyrdom <sup>e</sup>; and now, having ended their course, they are in the Lord. And the faith would have remained unimpaired in perpetuity had not some heretics in their wickedness dared to falsify it. For one Arius, and his companions, attempted to corrupt it, and to bring in an impiety against it, saying that the Son of God was from nothing, and was a creature and a thing made, and capa-

the bishops from Egypt, and the Thebaid, and the Libyas." Valesius thinks that Athanasius, with some of his suffragans, had come to Antioch to pay their duty to Jovian, and there wrote the letter. But the Benedictines refer to Theodoret iii. 2, to show that Athanasius simply "assembled the more learned bishops" (at Alexandria.) So Hefele treats the letter as synodical; Councils, sect. 87.

<sup>c</sup> Theodoret's copy of this letter (see Valesius's edition,) adds here, "and you will peacefully prolong your reign through a long series of years." Probably the words were erased in the Athanasian text after this loyal forecast had been falsified by Jovian's early death, Feb. 17, 364.

<sup>d</sup> It is characteristic of Athanasius to insist on the Scripturality of the Nicene faith, and on the sufficiency of Scripture evidence for the establishment of Catholic doctrine. "Divine Scripture," he tells his suffragans in 356, "is more sufficient than anything else." Ep. Eg, 4. So in de Deer, Nic. 32, etc. and below, e. Apollin. i. 8. "If there be one among divines . . . who commits his cause to the witness of Scripture more unreservedly than the rest . . . that one

is the great S. Athanasius," Keble, Appendix to Sermon on Primitive Tradition (Sermons, 1848, p. 406.) Compare S. Hilary, de Trinit. ii. 3. "De intelligentia enim haeresis, non de Scriptura est."

<sup>e</sup> Here is the other aspect of the case,—that the Nicene Faith is the true representative of primitive tradition: so S. Basil says that it had been held in his church of Cesarea from the days of the fathers, Ep. 140, 2. See Mozley's Essays, ii. 125, on the testimony borne by the bishops at Nicaea to the "general current tradition" of doctrine in their churches; and on Theory of Development, p. 163, "The Nicene Creed only asserted and guarded a doctrine which had been held from the first, viz. that of Christ's true and proper Divinity . . . The Nicene Creed . . . expressed this truth, and no more, by the word *Homousion* . . . The fathers said, This is the old doctrine that we have," etc. Observe the force of the Catholics' question as to Arianism, "Who has ever before heard such things?" Alexander in Soc. i. 6, (probably written by Athanasius;) Athan. Orat. i. 8, Apol. e. Ari. 49. So of other errors, Ep. Epictet. 2. Cf. Soc. v. 10.

ble of change<sup>f</sup>. And with these words they deceived many, so that even those who *seemed to be somewhat were led* <sup>Gal. 2. 6, 13.</sup> away by their blasphemy: however our holy fathers hastened to assemble, as we said before, in the Nicene Council and anathematized them, and drew up a written confession of the faith of the Catholic Church, so that while this faith was everywhere being preached, the heresy which had been kindled by the heretics was everywhere extinguished. So then this faith was existing everywhere in every Church, being acknowledged and preached in sincerity. But since now some persons who are minded to renew the Arian heresy have dared to set aside this faith confessed by the fathers at Nicæa, and pretend indeed to confess it, but in fact deny it, putting a false sense on the word coessential<sup>g</sup>, also blaspheming the Holy Spirit by saying that He is a creature, and that He came into being as a thing made by means of the Son<sup>h</sup>, we have deemed it to be necessary, in consideration of the mischief which is being done to the people by such blasphemy, to present to your Devotion the faith confessed at Nicæa, in order that your Piety may know what has been written with complete accuracy<sup>i</sup>, and how widely they go astray who teach what is contrary to it.

2. For know, O most religious Augustus, that these things<sup>j</sup> have been preached from the beginning, and that this faith was confessed by the fathers who assembled at

<sup>f</sup> The essential points of Arianism were, (1) That the Son was not eternal; "once He did not exist." (2) That the Son was not uncreated, but was *made* "God" by the Father: and consequently, (3) That He was "of a different essence" from God. It was a natural inference, that He was created, as the Angels were created, with a capacity for moral "change," that is, for falling away; that it was conceivable that He might have rebelled against God. See Alexander's Encyclical in Soc. i. 6. Athanasius discusses the *τρεπτόν* in Orat. c. Ari. i. 35.

<sup>g</sup> "Homoousion." Some of the ex-Arian Churchmen, or of the Arians who wished to find a home in the Church, had accepted this Nicene watchword in an inadequate sense, as if it were virtually equivalent to the

Semi-Arian "Homoiouσion." See the letter of a number of bishops, including both Meletius and Acacius, assembled at Antioch about this time, Soc. iii. 25. Compare Hefele, Hist. of Councils, sect. 87. A letter written in the name of Valentinian I. to the Arian bishops of Asia Minor, 375, alludes to some who long ago accepted the "Homoousion" insincerely, as if it meant no more than the "Homoiouσion" (the symbol of a yet lower Arianism, which would only admit generally that the Son was "like" to the Father, which might be taken in several senses), Theodoret iv. 8.

<sup>h</sup> See the Tome, I. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Theodoret—"with what accuracy it has been written."

<sup>j</sup> Theodoret—"that this is the faith that has been preached," &c.

Ep. ad  
Jov.

Nicæa, and that it has the assent of all the Churches in every place, those in Spain and Britain<sup>k</sup>, and those of Gaul, and of all Italy, and Dalmatia, and Dacia and Mysia<sup>l</sup>, Macedonia and all Greece, and those in all Africa, and Sardinia, and Cyprus, and Crete, and Pamphylia, and Lycia, and Isauria, and those in Egypt and the Libyas<sup>m</sup>, and Pontus, and Cappadocia, and the churches near us, and those in the East<sup>n</sup>, except a few who hold Arianism. For we know by experience the minds of all the above named, and we also possess letters of theirs. And you know, most religious Augustus, that even if some few persons contradict this faith, they cannot prejudice it, when all the world<sup>o</sup> is holding the Apostolic faith. For those men, having long been infected with the Arian heresy, are now more contentious in their resistance to true religion. And that your Piety may know it, although you do know it, we have still taken care to subjoin the faith confessed by the bishops<sup>p</sup> at Nicæa. Now the faith confessed by the fathers at Nicæa is this<sup>q</sup> :—

3. *We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of*

<sup>k</sup> Apol. c. Arian. 1. See Hilary's *De Synodis*, addressed to the Gallie and British bishops, who had "continued free from the contagion of (Arian) heresy." They had accepted the decisions of the Council of Sardica in favour of Athanasius, Athan. Apol. c. Ari. 1.

<sup>l</sup> Mæsia?

<sup>m</sup> Libya Cyrenaica, or Superior, and Libya Mæmoricæ or Secunda. See Bingham b. ix. 2. 6. (vol. iii. p. 51.)

<sup>n</sup> That is, the aggregate of fifteen provinces of which Antioch was the metropolis, Bingham b. ix. 1. 6. This peculiar sense of "the East" and "Eastern" appears in Cyril of Alexandria's *Apologia adversus Orientales*, i. e., the bishops dependent on the see of Antioch, then held by John.

<sup>o</sup> We must not press such language too strictly. Athanasius here yields, if it must be said, to the temptation of minimising the forces of the party which he wished his new sovereign to discomfit. Not long before, Hilary wrote, "Many through nearly all provinces of the Roman empire have now been infected with this pestilent doctrine . . ." *de Trin.* vi. 1. It

had become a tradition, secured in men's minds by stiff preconceptions which resisted all attempts to disturb them, *ib.* x. 1. Athanasius says in *De Synod.* 33 that all men were well content with the Nicene terms, &c.; which cannot be taken literally.

<sup>p</sup> Theodoret—"by the 318 bishops."

<sup>q</sup> This original Nicene Creed is also found in *Socrates*, i. 8; *S. Basil*, Ep. 140; *Cyril Alex.* Ep. ad Nest. 2, 3. For a Latin version see Hilary *De Synodis*, 84. Epiphanius, writing in 374 (Aneoratus, 120) gives as the Nicene creed that revised and enlarged form of it which we call Constantinopolitan, but without "God from God," and with the old Nicene clause, "that is, from the essence of the Father;" and then he gives a much longer form, which, he says, the whole Church at that time had begun to use on account of recent heresies. It is impossible to take this statement literally: and it is strange that Epiphanius should not have known the true text of the Creed of 325. Dr. Lumbé considers that the fathers of the Council of 381 put forth the "Constantinopolitan creed," if they did so,

*all things both visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, Only-begotten, that is, from the Essence of the Father<sup>r</sup>, God from God, Light from Light, Very God from Very God; begotten, not made; Coessential with the Father; By Whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things on earth; Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down, and was incarnate, became man, suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended into the heavens; will come to judge the living and dead. And in the Holy Spirit. But those who say, 'Once He was not,' and, 'before He was begotten He was not<sup>s</sup>', and that 'He was made out of nothing,' or say that the Son of God is from another substance<sup>t</sup> or essence, or is created, or changeable, or alterable, are anathematized by the Catholic and Apostolic Church.*

4. In this faith, O Augustus, it is necessary that all should abide, since it is divine and Apostolic, and that no one should disturb it by subtleties and logomachies<sup>u</sup>, as the Arian fanatics have done, who say that the Son of God is from nothing, and that once He was not, and that He is created, and made, and changeable. For on account of these assertions, as we said before, the Council of Nicaea anathematized this heresy, and confessed the true faith. For they have not called the Son simply like to the Fa-

not as a revised form of the Nicene, but under the mistake that it was the actual Nicene creed, (Hist. of Creeds, p. 69.) But he doubts whether they did put it forth at all. His reasons, however, seem inadequate. That it is ignored in Western documents of the period 391—423, and by the Council of Ephesus, is quite natural; for the West and the Alexandrian Church did not acknowledge the Council of 381. Thus, when Nestorius of Constantinople quotes as part of the Creed the words *ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἀγίου*, which were added in the revision, Cyril recites the original, and asks, "Where have they said about the Son that He was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin?" Adv. Nest. i. 6, 8. At Chaledon it was accepted along with the Nicene Creed proper, as the Creed of the 150 fathers (of 381.) If at that time it

was not familiar to all the bishops and churches, that is precisely consistent with what we know of the gradual recognition of the Second Council.

<sup>r</sup> This clause was omitted in the Constantinopolitan revision of the Creed: it being thought, apparently, that the idea was sufficiently expressed by "coessential with the Father."

<sup>s</sup> This Arian proposition meant, "Being the Son, He came into existence when He was 'begotten': therefore, of course, He could not have existed before." Here it was assumed that His Sonship depended on an event, whereas it was an eternal fact in the life of the Godhead. See Newman in Athanasian Treatises, i. 274.

<sup>t</sup> Hypostasis, used as equivalent to *οὐσία* or essence. See Athanasian Treatises, i. 66.

<sup>u</sup> On "logomachies," see the Tome, 8.

Ep. ad  
Jov.

ther<sup>x</sup>, lest He should be believed to be simply like to God, and not Very God from God. But they wrote the word "Coessential," which was characteristic of a genuine and very Son of the very and natural Father<sup>y</sup>. And again, they did not describe the Holy Spirit as foreign to the Father and the Son; but rather glorified Him with the Father and the Son<sup>z</sup> in the one faith of the Holy Trinity, because there is in the Holy Trinity at the same time one Godhead<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>x</sup> "Homoion." This vague formula of the Acacian section of Arians was intended to be used against the Semi-Arians, who called the Son *Homoios*, "like in essence." Acacius and his friends objected to this "technical" phrase, and advocated the "simpler" phrase, "Like." The result, with many minds, was practically to prepare the way for the Ultra-Arian "Anomoion," "Unlike." For "Like" was understood in the sense of mere moral affinity; and this was consistent with the Ultra-Arian position. See Newman's Arians, p. 312 ff.; comp. Athan. de Synod. 36; see Jerome adv. Lucifer. 18, "For the rejection of the word *Usia*, a plausible argument was offered; it was not found in 'Scripture,' &c. So Hilary says that Constantius (under Acacian influence) "would not have any words used which were not in 'Scripture,'" c. Const. 16. This principle, which had been suggested by earlier Arianizers, was embodied in what is called the "Second Sirmian" Creed of 357, in the "Dated Creed" of Sirmium, the Acacians' Creed read at Seleucia, and the Creed which was at last, under pressure, accepted by the Council of Ariminum in 359. It is criticized by Phoebadius [A.D. 358.] in *De Fid. Orth.* c. 3. Galland. v. 259.

<sup>y</sup> So in the *De Synodis*, 41, he says that Semi-Arians, such as Basil of

Ancyra, when they acknowledge the Son to be the "genuine and natural offspring of the Father," are not far from accepting even the "Homoios." The whole question, in fact, turned on the sense of the word Son, as applied to our Lord. Was His Sonship real, and therefore unique, and truly Divine? Then He was necessarily "of one essence with the Father." If He was not thus one with the Father, He was a Son by mere adoption and grace; cf. Hilary de Trin. xii. 2, "Nostra tantum haec sola religio est, Filium confiteri non adoptivum, sed natum." On the full force of the term "Only-begotten," see Liddon, *Bamp. Lect.* p. 233.

<sup>z</sup> This may have partly suggested the addition made in the revision of the Creed. S. Basil wrote to Epiphanius about 377, that he had told certain brethren, "We cannot make the slightest addition to the Nicene Creed, except the giving of glory to the Holy Spirit, because our fathers did but casually mention that point," Ep. 258, 2, comp. Ep. 140, 2. See Swete on *Doctrine of Holy Spirit*, p. 34.

<sup>a</sup> So Athanasius ad Serap. i. 17, "The whole Trinity is one God." So says Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. 6. 13; and in Orat. 25. 17 he anticipates the "Quienque" by saying, "Unity to be adored in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity."

## THE EPISTLE TO THE AFRICAN BISHOPS.

### INTRODUCTION.

THE use of the word “Africa” was at this time in an intermediate stage. One of the great dioceses of the Empire had acquired the name now extended to the continent: it included six provinces, the chief being Africa Proconsularis, the original “Africa,” the metropolis of which was Carthage. It is to the bishops of this “diocese” that the present letter is addressed, in 368 or 369, in the name of a Council of Egyptian prelates, for the purpose of destroying any prestige that might attach to the name of the Western Council of Ariminum, which, after beginning well, had ended so disastrously by acquiescing in an Arianizing creed. The authority of the Nicene Council is held up as all-sufficient and final: and the “Africans” are exhorted to abide simply by its Creed. The two most notorious Western Arians, Ursacius and Valens, whose “blasphemy,” says S. Hilary, (c. Const. 26) “the Africans had condemned” in the reign of Constantius, had been recently excommunicated by a Council held at Rome by Damasus: but the letter expresses surprise that Auxentius, the astute Arian who held the great see of Milan, and by a disingenuous profession of faith in Christ’s Divinity had contrived to secure the good opinion of Valentinian I. (see Hilary c. Auxentium) was not included in that censure.

### SYNODICAL LETTER OF THE BISHOPS OF EGYPT TO THE BISHOPS OF (WESTERN) AFRICA.

1. WE<sup>a</sup> may well be content with what has been written by our beloved fellow minister Damasus<sup>b</sup>, bishop of Great Rome, and such a large number of bishops who assembled with him, and not less so with the decisions of the other

<sup>a</sup> The opening passage is translated by Waterland, Works, i. 549.

<sup>b</sup> Damasus became bishop of Rome in the autumn of 366, amid scenes of violent conflict between his partisans and those of his rival Ursicinus, as to which the Pagan historian Ammianus gives some details, xxvii. 3. 13. Charges directly implicating Damasus were made in a still extant document by two presbyters of the unsuccessful party. “What he would have replied to these accusations, we

have no means of knowing; but we can say that he used his success well.” Dict. Chr. Biogr. The allusion to Synodical writings issued by him refers to the Roman council of 367 or 368: the next Council in which the consubstantiality of the Holy Trinity was affirmed, and Auxentius (see below) was excommunicated, (Mansi, Cone. iii. 443. Sozomen, vi. 23. Theodoret ii. 22,) is referred by Tillemont and Maran to 371, by Hefele to 369.

**AD AFR.** Councils which were held in Gaul<sup>c</sup> and Italy, concerning the sound faith, which was bestowed by Christ, proclaimed by the apostles, and handed down by the fathers who assembled at Nicaea from all parts of the Roman world. For all this solicitude was then shown on account of the Arian heresy, in order that those who had fallen into it might be recovered, and those who had invented it might be exposed. In this faith, then, the whole world long ago agreed: and now also, many councils having been held, all those in Dalmatia and Dardania, Macedonia, Epirus, Greece, Crete, and the other islands, Sicily<sup>d</sup>, and Cyprus, and Pamphylia, Lycia, Isauria, and all Egypt and the Libyas, and very many in Arabia, have been reminded of, and have recognized this creed; and admired those who signed it; because if there had been left among them any bitter plant springing up from the root of the Arians—we mean Auxentius<sup>e</sup>, and Ursacius, and Valens<sup>f</sup>, and those who think as they do,—such persons were by means of their

<sup>c</sup> Compare Ep. to Epiet. 1. The council of Paris in 361, which declared in favour of the Nicene creed, (Hilary, Fragment 11,) may have been in his thoughts together with the Synod held by Liberius for the reception of three envoys of a number of Semi-Arian bishops who in 366 resolved to adopt the Nicene faith, and so to obtain the help of the Western Church and of Valentinian, against the tyranny of the Arianizing Valens. Soc. iv. 12.

<sup>d</sup> After their visit to Rome, these envoys professed the Nicene faith before a Council in Sicily and were received into Communion, Soc. iv. 12.

<sup>e</sup> See Athan. Encycl. ad Aeg. 7. "him they call Auxentius," and Hist. Arian. 75. that he was transferred from Cappadocia to the see of Milan after the expulsion of Dionysius (in 355) and he was a man "of business rather than religion." Hilary of Poitiers wrote a book "Contra Auxentium," advising the faithful of Milan to eschew his communion, and denouncing the insincerity of his professions of belief in Christ's "true Divinity," which had deceived the orthodox Valentinian. At the end of this tract is Auxentius's letter to Valentinian and Valens, containing

that profession, together with an avowal of adhesion to the Council of Ariminum. According to Hilary, Auxentius had begun his career as a presbyter under Gregory, the Arian usurper of the see of Alexandria in 340. S. Ambrose, who succeeded him as bishop, described him as a persecutor of Catholics. (*Sermo de Basiliis tradendis.*)

<sup>f</sup> Ursacius bishop of Singidunum, and Valens bishop of Mursa, were Arian prelates described in 339 as "young both in years and in mind," Athan. Apol. c. Arian. 13, who took an active part in the Arian attempt to ruin Athanasius by false charges, ib. They recanted Arianism at a Council of Milan in 345, and again in 347 in the presence of Julius of Rome, and wrote in a friendly strain to Athanasius, Ath. Apol. c. Arian. 1. 58. Hist. Arian. 26; but in 351 they recanted their recantation, pretending that it had been made under fear of the Western Emperor Constantius, (who had been slain in 350,) ib. 29, a pretence refuted in detail by Athanasius, Apol. c. Arian. 59. ff. Valens, the abler of the two, was "the champion of Arianism" in the Latin Church, and gained the favour of Constantius by a "fortunate artifice" at

writings cut off and cast away. Enough, then, and sufficient in themselves, as we said before, were the conclusions arrived at in Nicæa, for the overthrow of every impious heresy, and for the security and advancement of the doctrine of the Church. But since we have heard that some persons are minded to fight against that doctrine, and attempt to bring forward the name of a certain council as held at Ariminum, and contend that it, rather than the Nicene Council, should be held authoritative: we deem it necessary to write and admonish you not to tolerate such men as these, for this is nothing else than a new offshoot of the Arian heresy. For what is the real aim of persons who set aside the Council which was held against that heresy, i. e. the Nicene Council, if it is not that Arianism shall prevail? What then do they deserve but to be called Arians, and to share the same punishment which was inflicted on the Arians? they who have neither stood in awe of the Divine saying, *Remove not the ancient boun-* <sup>Prov. 22.</sup> *daries which thy fathers set up*, and, *He who curseth father* <sup>28.</sup> *or mother, let him die the death*, nor have paid any regard <sup>Exod. 21.</sup> <sup>17.</sup> to the fathers who decreed that those who held opinions contrary to their confession should be anathema.

2. For on this account did the Council of Nicæa take place as œcumenical, three hundred and eighteen bishops<sup>g</sup> having assembled together to treat of the faith, because of the Arian impiety, that there might never again be held any particular Councils on the pretext of treating of the faith, but that even if they were held, they might be of no authority. For what is wanting to the Nicene Council, that anyone should seek for something newer? It is full of true religion<sup>h</sup>, beloved. This is the Council that has filled the whole world: it is this which has been recognized even by Indians<sup>i</sup>, and by all Christians who dwell among the other barbaric nations. Vain then is the labour of men

the time of the battle of Mursa, Newman's Arians, p. 286. see Sulp. Severus, Hist. Sac. ii. 38. Hilary says that he forcibly prevented Dionysius of Milan from signing the Nicene Creed at Milan, ad Const. i. 8. For his trickery at Ariminum, see Jerome adv. Lucifer. 18, Sulpicius ii. 44.

<sup>g</sup> In Hist. Ari. 66. he says, "300

more or less." The number 318, here given, has been accepted by later writers; and Liberius had already connected it with Gen. 14. 14: Soc. iv. 12.

<sup>h</sup> Ἐνορθεῖας, cf. Tome, 8.

<sup>i</sup> Apparently, the Ethiopians or Abyssinians under Frumentius or Salama, whom Athanasius had consecrated as their bishop.

AD AFR. who have often made attempts against it. For up to this time such persons have held ten councils and somewhat more, changing their ground at each, taking away some things from their earlier councils, making alterations in, and additions to, the later<sup>k</sup>. And to this day they have got no good by all their writing, suppressing, using force, S. Matt. not knowing that *every plant which the Father in heaven 15. 13.* *hath not planted shall be rooted up*: while *the Word of 1 Pet. 1.* *the Lord*, spoken through the Ecumenical Council in Nicæa, *abideth for ever*. For if one sets numbers against 25. numbers, the members of the Nicene Council are as much more numerous than those of the particular councils, as the whole is greater than the part. And if any one wishes to distinguish the cause for holding the Nicene Council from the causes of those many subsequent councils assembled by those men, he will find that it was the Nicene which had the reasonable cause, and the others which were

<sup>k</sup> Compare the remarks in Athan. de Synodis 14, 32, as to the manifold formularies of the Arian synods. In that work he reckons eleven such documents, i. e. the four so-called of the Dedication Council of Antioch, the "Macrostich," the "first Sirmian," the "second Sirmian" (called by S. Hilary "blasphemous,") the "fourth" Sirmian or Creed dated by the Consulates (Whitsun Eve, 359,) the Acacian formulary presented at Seleucia, Sept. 359; that of Ariminum (which had been drawn up at Nicæa in Oct. 359, see Soc. ii. 37;) that of Antioch (361.) And S. Hilary, ad Const. ii. 5. (rhetorically identifying himself with the authors of these formulas) "We settle creeds by the year or the month," &c: (quoted in Newman's Arians, p. 459.) Hilary tells us also of the *true* "first Sirmian" confession, Arian in character, but very brief, framed at Sirmium 347—8, Fragn. 2, 21: and Lucifer (Morien-dum, 18) and Sulpicius (ii. 39) of an Arian formula put forth in Constantius's name at Milan in 355. Socrates reckons two Antiochene creeds, a third sent to Constans (the so-called fourth of Antioch; the third, by Theophronius, he ignores;) a fourth carried by Eudoxius into Italy (the Macrostich;) three Sirmian (one of which was the

Dated creed or "creed of the Consulates;") the Acacians' at Seleucia, and that of "Constantinople;" nine in all, ii. 41. It is to be observed that the Creed of the Consulates (given in De Synodis, 10) and the Creed of Nicæa-Ariminum-Constantinople (ib. 30) were both of the Homoean or Acacian type: whereas the Antiochene formula of 361 was Anomoean, and the "blasphemous" creed called the second Sirmian came very near to the Anomoion (ib. 28.) It was the Acacian type which triumphed at Ariminum. Athanasius's "ten Arian Councils" may be thus reckoned: 1. that of Tyre and Jerusalem; 2. the Dedication Council; 3. that of the Macrostich; 4, 5, 6, 7, four at Sirmium, i. e. that of 351 against Photinus, &c, that of the "blasphemia," that of the Semi-Arian "compilation" in 358, and that of the Dated Creed; 8. Ariminum; 9. Constantinople in 360; 10. Antioch in 361. To these might be added the council of Constantinople in 335, the council of Philippopolis, held by the Ariauizing seceders from Sardica, the council of Beziers in 356, the Anomoean council of Antioch early in 358, the Semi-Arian councils of Ancyra and Seleucia, and the council or conference of Nicæa.

brought together by violence, on account of hatred and contentiousness. For the Nicene was assembled on account of the Arian heresy, and on account of the Paschal festival<sup>1</sup>, since those in Syria, Cilicia, and Mesopotamia were at variance with us, and kept it themselves at the time at which the Jews kept it. But, thanks to the Lord, as about the faith, so about the holy festival<sup>m</sup>, an agreement took place. And this was the cause of the Nicene Council: but the subsequent ones were indeed innumerable, and were held in opposition to the Ecumenical Council.

3. These points, then, being thus made clear<sup>n</sup>, who will adopt the position of those who refer to<sup>o</sup> the Ariminian Council, or any other than the Nicene? Who will not detest those who set aside the decisions of the fathers, and prefer the more recent decisions made at Ariminum by means of contentiousness and violence<sup>p</sup>? And who will choose to concur with these men, who do not even accept their own conclusions? For they, by writing different things at different times in their own councils, some ten or more, as we said above, are plainly seen to have become accusers of each of those councils, and are in much the same condition as those Jewish traitors of old: for as the latter *left the fountain of living waters, and hewed out for themselves broken cisterns which could hold no water*, as it is written by the prophet Jeremiah, so these men, in their warfare against the one and Ecumenical Council, hewed out for themselves many councils, and all their councils have been shown to be empty, *like a handful of corn without strength*. Let us then, refuse to tolerate those who refer<sup>7.</sup> Hos. 8. LXX.

<sup>1</sup> On the Paschal question, as brought before the Nicene Council, see Hefele, Hist. Councils, s. 37, cf. Athan. de Synodis. 5.

<sup>m</sup> See Constantine's letter on this point, Euseb. Vit. Con. iii. 17. Soc. i. 9. The settlement arrived at was, that not only should Easter, the Christian "Pascha," be always celebrated on a Sunday, but that if the day of the Jewish Passover fell on a Sunday, Easter Day should be the Sunday after; and that it should be kept after the vernal equinox. In

regard to the reckoning of the equinox, the Council practically followed the Alexandrian rule rather than the Roman, for it directed the bishop of Alexandria to announce the right day for Easter, annually, to the Roman Church, which was to pass on the information to other churches.

<sup>n</sup> This passage is quoted by Theodoret, Hist. ii. 23.

<sup>o</sup> Literally, "name," "mention."

<sup>p</sup> See the account in Newman's Arians, p. 359, and see below c. 4.

AD AFR. to the Ariminian council<sup>q</sup>, or any other than the Nicene. For those who do refer to the Ariminian, seem not to be aware of what was done at it: otherwise they would have been silent. For you know, beloved, having yourselves been informed by those who went from your country to Ariminum<sup>r</sup>, how Ursacius and Valens, Eudoxius<sup>s</sup> and Auxentius<sup>t</sup>—and Demophilus<sup>u</sup> was there with them—were deposed<sup>v</sup>, for having desired to adopt some other formu-

<sup>q</sup> About a year before, sixty-six Semi-Arian bishops had signified to Pope Liberius their acceptance of the Nicene Creed, and their rejection of that which was "read" at Ariminum. Liberius answered that "almost all those who had been deceived or misled at Ariminum had come to a right mind, and anathematized the creed of those who were there assembled, and signed the Catholic and Apostolic Creed which was divinely put forth at Nicæa," see Soc. iv. 12. Jerome tells us how earnestly many of the bishops who had been beguiled or terrorised at Ariminum afterwards protested "by the Body of the Lord" that they had never wilfully abandoned the true faith, *adv. Lucifer*. 19. See Tillemont, vi. 462. A Roman council of A. D. 371 writes to the Illyrians, (Theod. ii. 22.) that the Ariminian bishops declared that they had not understood that the creed presented to them was contrary to the Nicene. "Neque enim," says the original Latin, Mansi, iii. 459, "præjudicium aliquod nasci potuit ex numero eorum qui apud Ariminum convenerunt," for neither the Bishop of Rome, "enjus ante omnes fuit expetenda sententia," nor Vincent (of Capua), nor others such as they, gave assent to the decisions, &c. The bishops at Ariminum numbered "rather more than 400," Sulpicius, ii. 41. Hilary says that this council, "has been religiously annulled by all," *c. Aux.* 8.

<sup>r</sup> As Restitutus of Carthage, and Musonius from the Byzacene province. The latter was venerable for his age, Jerome *adv. Lucifer*, 18.

<sup>s</sup> According to Philostorgius, iv. 4, Eudoxius was the son of a martyr. He was an Arian before 331: for a time he acted with the "Eusebians," and, having been elected bishop of Germanicia, was one of the three en-

voys who carried the "Macrostich" creed into Italy, Soc. ii. 18. "He afterwards joined the Anomœans," (Newman's Arians, p. 285,) and made their leader Actius his companion; procured the see of Antioch by an intrigue in 358: was transferred to Constantinople in January of 360, and signalized his accession by uttering a "wanton impiety," (Newman) intended to condense the Arian theory into a terse form. He was the main instigator of the Arian persecution under Valens; his real sympathies were with the extreme Arians, but he had not courage to support Actius against the displeasure of Constantius, nor Eutropius against the indignation of his orthodox diocese of Cyzicus. He died in 370.

<sup>t</sup> So he says in *de Synod.* 9; but the original document in Hilary's Fragment 7 omits Auxentius and Demophilus. Auxentius afterwards claimed the Council as in his favour, Hil. *c. Aux.* 15.

<sup>u</sup> Bishop of Berea in Thrace: an Arian of the Acacian party. In 370 he became the Arian bishop of Constantinople, Soc. iv. 24, where he was said to have an outward appearance of orthodoxy and piety, Basil, *Ep. 48*. In 380 he was expelled by Theodosius, Soc. v. 6. Philostorgius, the ultra-Arian historian, says that he was a confused, impetuous speaker, and that he supposed the "Divinity of Christ" (in the unreal Arian sense) to have swallowed up his humanity—a sort of anticipation of Eutychianism, but consistent with the Arian ideas, see *c. Apollin.* i. 15. In one of the letters ascribed to Liberius, Demophilus is named as having persuaded him to Arianize, Hil. *Fragn.* 6. 6.

<sup>v</sup> See Hefele, *Hist. Councils*, 82. The excommunication was pronounced July 213, 39, according to Hilary.

lary than the Nicene: when also, being called upon to anathematize the Arian heresy, they declined to do so, and chose rather to be its patrons. But the bishops, those genuine servants of the Lord, and true believers, in number nearly two hundred, wrote down this, that they were content with the Nicene Council alone, and did not seek for, or think of, anything more or less than that. This, too, they signified to Constantius, who also had ordered the Council to be held<sup>y</sup>. But those who had been deposed at Ariminum went off to Constantius, and caused the others who had expressed their mind against them to be insulted, and to be threatened that they should not return to their dioceses, and to suffer violence in Thrace in the same winter, so that they might submit to the new decisions made by them<sup>z</sup>.

4. If then any persons mention Ariminum, let them first bring forward the deposition of the above named, and

Fragment 7, where the bishop who moves it, so to say, gives as the reason, that the persons in question, Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, Caius, (Auxentius and Demophilus being omitted) "have, by continually changing their creeds, disturbed all the churches, and are now trying to infuse their heretical opinions into Christian minds; for they want to subvert the Nicene formulary, and they have also brought here a creed written by themselves which it was not lawful for us to accept." It seems that after this proposal in favour of the Dated Creed had been rejected, they made another attempt with some altered version of it, Fragm. 8.

<sup>y</sup> See a free version of their letter in Athan. de Synodis, 10. The original Latin is in Hilary, Fragment 8.

<sup>z</sup> Hefele, l. c. The orthodox but inexperienced deputies from Ariminum were compelled by Constantius to meet Valens, Ursacius, and other Arians at Nicè in Thrace, where on October 10, 359, as we see by the record given by Hilary, Fragment 8, they were harassed and deluded into accepting an Acacian formula, which called the Son simply "like to the Father," omitting "in all things," and proscribing both "ousia" and "hypostasis." See Ath. de Syn. 30.

On their return, they were excommunicated by the Council; but at last the Council itself was led by similar treatment to follow their example. Sulpicius says that this creed (of Nicè) was written by unprincipled men, "ab improbis hominibus," who wrapped up its meaning in deceptive words, ii. 43. It put aside "the word *ousia*" as ambiguous and non-Scriptural, and while acknowledging the Son to be like to the Father, it implicitly suggested the idea of His "inequality." The great body of the bishops at Ariminum, partly from weariness, partly from weakness, at last accepted it. Valens and Ursacius, he adds (c. 44), recommended the few who stood out to accept it as "Catholic;" to reject it, they said, would be to increase discord: but it might, if they wished, be made clearer by additions. The bishops caught at this idea, and proposed certain anathemas which were more or less anti-Arian. Valens proposed another which embodied an old Arian statement, "The Son of God is not a creature like the rest of the creatures;" and the bishops, not seeing what this implied, acquiesced in it. By such artifices the creed of Nicè became the creed of Ariminum. Compare Jerome adv. Lucifer. 18.

AN AFR. what the bishops wrote, saying that no one ought to seek for anything more than the decisions made by the fathers at Nicaea, nor mention any other Council but that one. But these things they conceal, while they put forward what was done by violence in Thrace, whereby they show that they undertake to represent<sup>a</sup> the Arian heresy, and are alien from the sound faith. And if any one chooses to examine, side by side, that great Council itself and those which they have originated, he will find how orthodox was the one, how senseless the others. Those who met at Nicaea were not deposed before they met, but confessed the Son to be “from the essence of the Father;” but these men having been deposed once and twice<sup>b</sup>, and a third time at Ariminum itself, dared to write that one “ought not to say that God had an essence or a hypostasis.” From this one may observe, brethren, how those at Nicaea are full of the very spirit of the Scriptures, for God says, in Exodus, *I am He who is*<sup>c</sup>, and by Jeremiah, *Who is on His foundation and has seen His word?* and a little after, *If they had stood on My foundation<sup>d</sup> and heard My words.* Now ‘hypostasis’ is essence, and has no other meaning than the very thing which exists, which Jeremiah calls “existence,” saying, *And they heard not the voice of “existence”*<sup>e</sup>. For ‘hypostasis’ and essence are existence. For it is, and exists. With this in his mind, Paul wrote to the Hebrews<sup>f</sup>, *Who being an effulgence of His glory, and the exact impress of His ‘hypostasis’*<sup>g</sup>. But those persons who think that they understand the Scriptures, and give themselves the title of wise, not choosing to use the word ‘hypostasis’ about God, (for this is what they wrote at Ariminum, and in other councils of theirs<sup>h</sup>), how can it be said that they were not justly deposed, when they themselves say, like *the fool in his*

<sup>a</sup> οὐτες ὑποκρίται, playing the part of.

<sup>b</sup> They had been deposed by the Council of Sardica, Ath. Apol. c. Ari. 49; and were condemned by the “Africans” (see Introd.)

<sup>c</sup> Compare Orat. c. Ari. iii. 63. “For if we do but hear about God, we know and understand that He is He who is.”

<sup>d</sup> “Hypostasis;” see Tome, 5 and note.

<sup>c</sup> ‘Τπάρξεως,’ i.e. of any living thing.

<sup>f</sup> Observe the unhesitating ascription of this Epistle to S. Paul. So in Ad Epict. 5. c. Apollin. i. 4. Ep. Eg. 13. &c., see Westcott on the Canon of N. T. p. 364.

<sup>g</sup> In Orat. c. Ari. iii. 65 he takes ὑποστάσεως in Heb. 1. 3 to mean “essence.”

<sup>h</sup> At the Sirmian councils of 357 (the “blasphemy”) and 359, (the Dated Creed.)

Exod. 3.  
14.  
Jer. 23.  
18, 22.  
(LXX.)  
ὑποστή-  
ματι,  
ὑποστά-  
σει.  
Jer. 9.  
10.  
(LXX.)  
ὑπάρξεως  
Heb. 1.  
3.

Ps. 14. 1- deposited, when they themselves say, like *the fool in his*

heart, *There is no God*<sup>i</sup>? Again, the fathers taught at Nicaea that the Son, the Word, was not a creature, not a thing made: for they had read, *All things came into being* <sup>s. John 1. 3.</sup> *through Him, and in Him all things were created and do* <sup>Col. 1. 16.</sup> *subsist.* But those men, being rather Arians than Christians, have dared in those other councils of their own to say that He is a creature, and one of those things made, of which the Word Himself is Framer and Maker. For if all things came into being through Him, and He Himself also is a creature, He would then be His own Creator. And how can that which is created, create? or how is the Creating One created?

5. But neither in that position do they feel shame while they say such things as render them detested by all; while they refer to “Ariminum” simply, yet are proved to have been actually deposed therein. And as to that sentence which was written at Nicaea, that the Son is “coessential with the Father,” on account of which they profess to contend against the Council, and make a noise on all sides like the buzzing of gnats; concerning that phrase, either they stumble upon it in ignorance, like those who *stumble* on <sup>Rom. 9. 33.</sup> *that stone of stumbling placed in Sion:* or else they do understand it, but go on fighting and ceaselessly murmuring just because it is a true and correct decision against their heresy. For it is not the phrases which annoy them, but the condemnation of themselves which was involved in the Nicene decision; and if they would fain conceal the fact, although they know it, yet it is our duty to mention it, that thereby also we may exhibit the truthful accuracy of the great Council. For when the assembled bishops<sup>k</sup> were resolved to put down the impious phrases invented by the Arians, that the Son was from things which did not exist, and that the Son was a creature and a thing made, and that there was a period when He was not, and that He was of a changeable nature<sup>l</sup>, and to write down the acknowledged sayings of Scripture, that the Word is from God, by na-

<sup>i</sup> Here it must be owned, he unduly strains the argument. Those whom he attacks merely objected to the use of a technical term or two.

<sup>k</sup> Quoted by Theodoret, i. 8. See

most of this passage in Newman's Arians, p. 238.

<sup>l</sup> Compare lists of Arian propositions in Orat. c. Arian. i. 5. de Synodis 14. Ep. ad Aegypt. 12.

AD AFR. ture Only-begotten, the only Power and Wisdom of the 1 S. John Father, *true God*, as John saith<sup>m</sup>, and, as Paul wrote, *ef- 5. 20. fulgence of the Father's glory and impress of His hypostasis*: the Eusebians, drawn away by their own vain opinions, began to say to each other<sup>n</sup>, “Let us agree to this, for we 1 Cor. 8. also are from God<sup>o</sup>: for *there is one God, from whom are 6. all things*, and, *The old things are passed away, behold, all 2 Cor. 5. 17, 18. things are become new, and all things are from God.*” They also took account of that passage in the “Shepherd<sup>p</sup>,” “First of all things believe that the God who created and organized all things, and brought them out of non-existence into existence, is one.” But the bishops having observed their craftiness and the artifice of impiety, gave a clearer explanation of the phrase “from God,” and wrote that the Son was “from the essence of God<sup>q</sup>;” that the creatures might be said to be “from God,” because they are not from themselves without a cause, but have a beginning<sup>r</sup> of their coming into existence, but the Son alone might be regarded as proper to the Father’s essence, for this properly belongs to an only-begotten and veritable son in regard to a father. And this was the occasion of the adoption of the phrase, “from the essence.” Again, when the bishops asked those who seemed to be a small number whether they would say that the Son was not a creature, but the only Power and Wisdom of the Father, and in all points the eternal and unvarying image<sup>s</sup> of the Father, and true

<sup>m</sup> He so interprets the text in *Orat. c. Ari. iii. 20. Ep. Egypt. 43.*

<sup>n</sup> Compare the parallel description of the private colloquies of the Arianisers at Nicæa in *Athan. de Decr. Nic. 20.* “They were caught whispering to each other, and winking with their eyes” &c.

<sup>o</sup> This quibble was suggested by George, then an Alexandrian priest, afterwards bishop of Laodicea. *Athan. de Synod. 17.*

<sup>p</sup> *Hermas, Pastor, Mand. 1.* The passage is cited by Athanasius again, *de Incarn. Verbi, 3; de Decr. Nic. 18*, referring, as here, to the Arian misuse of it. See other citations in *Irenæus iv. 20, 2; Origen de Principi. i. 3, 3; Eusebius, v. 8.*

<sup>q</sup> See *Athan. de Synod. 36*, that this

phrase represented the Son as the true or genuine Son of the Father.

<sup>r</sup> *Αρχήν*, used of a beginning of existence, as of what did not exist from eternity: as *Orat. c. Arian ii. 52; iv. 26*; not as when the Father is called *ἀρχή* or principium of the existence of the Son, e.g. *Orat. c. Arian. iv. 1, comp. Newman, Tracts Theol. and Eccl. p. 122.*

<sup>s</sup> *Εἰκόνα . . . ἀπαράλλακτον κατὰ πάντα.* The phrase, “unvarying image of God,” i. e. fully adequate representation of the Father, was thus proposed by the bishops at Nicæa, and, like other phrases, accepted by the few Arians in an evasive sense. It was afterward adopted by the Semi-Arians, and taken into the creed of the Dedication Council of Antioch, *Athan. de*

God, they caught the Eusebians making signals to each other, to this effect, "These expressions belong to us also, for we are called *God's image and glory*; and of us it is said, *For we, the living, always*<sup>11. 7.</sup>; and there are many 'powers,' and *all the power of the Lord went forth from the land of Egypt*, and the caterpillar and the locust<sup>2 Cor. 4. 11. Exod. 12. 41.</sup> are called *a great power*, and, *The Lord of powers is with us, the God of Jacob is our helper*. And we indeed are in the position of belonging properly to God, not in a commonplace way, but because He has called us brethren. And if also, they even call the Son true 'God,' that does not trouble us: for since He has been made so, He is true (God<sup>25. Ps. 16. 7.</sup>)"

6. Such were the unsound thoughts of the Arians. But here also the bishops, perceiving their craftiness, collected<sup>y</sup> from the Scriptures the phrase, "effulgence," and the *Heb. 1. 3.* "fountain," and "stream," and "impress" in relation to "hypostasis," and the texts, *In thy light shall we see light*, *Ps. 36. 9.* and, *I and the Father are one*. And then they inserted in *S. John 10. 30.* their formulary a clearer and compendious phrase, that the Son was "coessential with the Father:" for all the expressions above quoted have this meaning. And the Arians cavil, that the phrases chosen are "not in Scripture," is proved by their own language to be idle: for it is after they have supported their impiety by means of non-Scriptural phrases<sup>z</sup>, (for the phrases, "Out of nothing," and, "Once there was (a period) when He was not<sup>a</sup>," are non-

Synodis 23, 37: see note on the passage, Athan. Treatises i. 106, that the Catholics insisted on its true sense as really amounting to the idea of the Homoousion; for none but a coessential Son could be a perfect Image of the Father. Athanasius asks the Acacians who rejected the Homoousion as well as the Homoousion, how they could profess at the Seleucian Council in 359 to have no objection to the Antiochene Creed, which contained the phrase, "unvarying Image," &c. de Synodis 38.

<sup>t</sup> A curious instance of catching at a word or two of a sentence, in total disregard of context.

<sup>u</sup> This audacious comparison was afterwards put forward in a treatise by Asterius the Arian "sophist," Athan. de Synodis 18.

<sup>x</sup> I. e. "if He, being in fact a creature, has received from the Father the title of true God, we recognize Him by that title." The affinity of Arianism to Polytheism comes out here. Arians had no difficulty about the acknowledgment of a titular Divinity: and this explains their readiness to call the Son "God."

<sup>y</sup> On this concentration of the sense of several texts into the one word Homoousion, see Ath. de Syn. 45. Deer. Nic. 20: and his successor Peter in Theod. iv. 22.

<sup>z</sup> A favourite retort of his, de Synod. 36. Orat. c. Ari. 1. 30.

<sup>a</sup> For  $\hat{\eta}\nu \hat{\sigma}\tau\epsilon \hat{o}\nu\kappa \hat{\eta}\nu \delta \hat{\tau}\iota\hat{o}\sigma$ , see Soc. i. 5. Dionysius of Rome had used, "If the Son came into existence,  $\hat{\eta}\nu \hat{\sigma}\tau\epsilon \hat{o}\nu\kappa \hat{\eta}\nu$ ," as a *reductio ad absurdum*: ap. Ath. Deer. Nic. 26. According to

**AD AFR.** Scriptural,) that they complain of having been condemned on the ground of non-Scriptural expressions devised in the interest of true religion. These men, then, as if sprung from a dunghill, have indeed *spoken from the earth*: but the bishops wrote as they did, not as if they had found out their phrases for themselves, but as preserving the testimony derived from fathers: for bishops of old time, about a hundred and thirty years ago, those I mean of great Rome and of our city<sup>b</sup>, rebuked in writing those who called the Son a creature and not coessential with the Father. And this fact was known to Eusebius, sometime bishop of Cæsarea, who at first went along with the Arian heresy<sup>c</sup>, but afterwards signed (the Creed) in the Nicene Council itself, and affirmed in a letter to his own people, “We know that among the ancients certain learned and eminent bishops and writers have used the word ‘coessential’ in reference to the Godhead of the Father and the Son<sup>d</sup>.”

7. Why then do they still mention Ariminum, where they were deposed? Why do they decline the authority of the Nicene Council, in which even their fathers, by signing, acknowledged that the Son was from the essence of, and coessential with, the Father? Why do they run about? for now it is not only against the bishops who assembled at Nicæa that they are fighting, but also against

Socrates, this proposition was the first announced by Arians. See Newman's *Arians*, p. 211.

<sup>b</sup> Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, was complained of to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, about 260, on account of language which seemed to represent the Son as a creature. He explained himself by quoting some phrases of his which distinctly recognized the Son's coeternity, and others which “did not differ in meaning from the phrase ‘coessential,’ although he had not used it, not having found it in Scripture,” see Athan. de Sent. Dionysii, 15, 18, see de Deer. Nic. 25. Athanasius defends Dionysius's orthodoxy by arguing that he was speaking only of our Lord's Manhood. Dionysius of Rome, in an extant fragment, strongly asserts the Divinity of the Son with the Trinity in Unity. Athan.

is in error here (as also in *de Synod.* 44.) as to the date: it was little more than 100 years before the time at which he was writing.

<sup>c</sup> The question of the Arianism or orthodoxy of Eusebius would hardly have assumed prominence but for his “indisputable alliance with the Arian party” (Bp. Lightfoot, in *Dict. Chr. Biog.*); hence Newman says that “his acts are his confession,” *Arians*, p. 269. He was swayed by admiration for Origen and fear of Sabellianism. He once in a letter denied Christ to be true God, Ath. *de Syn.* 17. See an account of his life by the present translator, in the edition of his *History* published at the Clarendon Press in 1873.

<sup>d</sup> See the letter of Eusebius to his own diocese, c. 7, at the end of Athan. *de Deer. Nic.* and in Theodoret i. 12. *Cp. Deer. Nic.* 3.

their own great bishops, and against their own friends. Of whom then are they the heirs and successors? How can they apply the word ‘fathers<sup>e</sup>’ to those whose confession, so excellently and apostolically framed, they do not accept? Else, if they think that they are able to contradict it, let them say, or rather answer, that they may be proved to come into collision with themselves: Do they believe the Son when He says, *I and the Father are One*, and, *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father?*

S. John  
10. 30.  
Ib. 14. 9.

“Yes,” they will say, “since it is written, we believe it.” But if they are further asked to say how They are one<sup>f</sup>, and how he that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father, they will certainly, I presume, say, “In respect of likeness,” unless they have completely come into agreement with those whose opinions are akin to their own, and who are called Anomœans<sup>g</sup>. But if they are again asked, How is He like? they will be bold to say, that by “perfect virtue and agreement He wills the same as the Father, and wills not what the Father wills not<sup>h</sup>. ” But let them learn that he whose likeness to God has been produced by virtue and the act of willing has also freedom of changing his will; but not so is the Word, unless indeed His likeness to the Father is so far from being essential, that it is but partial and analogous to the human. Now, this is what belongs to us, who are brought into being, and whose nature is created. For we too, although we are not able to become like to God in essence, yet imitate Him as we

<sup>e</sup> Comp. Athan. de Synodis 13.

<sup>f</sup> See Athan. Orat. c. Arian. iii. 3, that this text and S. John 14. 10 shew “that the Godhead is the same and the essence one.” So Orat. iii. 10, that no saint ever dared to say, “I and the Father are one.” Cf. S. Ambrose de Fide, i. 1. 9; S. Aug. in loc.; Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 183; Pressensé, Jésus-Christ, p. 521.

<sup>g</sup> On the Anomœans see Newman’s Arians, p. 345. Their founder was Aetius “surnamed the Godless” (Athan. de Synod. 6, 38): their principal theologian was Eunomius. (cf. Soc. iv. 7.) Their formula or watchword was intended to assert that the Son was neither “of one essence with the Father” (Catholic), nor “like to Him in

“essence” (Semi-Arian), nor even simply “like to Him” (Acacian), but “unlike to Him.” They thus carried out, boldly and logically, the original Arian proposition, that He was a “creature” and a “work.”

<sup>h</sup> See Athan. de Synod. 48, that a mere moral union with God could be predicated of holy men and Angels. Comp. Orat. c. Ari. iii. 10. Although the Angels have attained to moral indefectibility, this is by grace, not from their nature. On the attempt to reduce the “oneness” to “an unity of character and will . . . not in nature,” see Newman’s Arians, p. 233. Cf. Deer. Nic. 6: De Synod. 45: Hilary c. Const. 14.

AD AFR. are improved by virtue; a privilege, too, which has been  
 S. Luke granted us by the Lord, who says, *Be ye merciful, as<sup>i</sup> your*  
 6. 36. *Father is merciful: Be ye perfect, as your Father who is*  
 S. Matt. *in heaven is perfect.* But no one can deny that things  
 5. 48. brought into being are changeable: for Angels trans-  
 gressed, and Adam disobeyed, and all stand in need of the  
 grace of the Word. But what is changeable can never be  
 like to God who is unchangeable, even as what has been  
 created can never be like the Creator. Wherefore it was  
 Ps. 82. 1. in reference to us that the Saint said, *O God, who shall*  
 (LXX.) *be likened unto Thee?* and, *Who is like Thee among the*  
 Ib. 55. *gods, O Lord?* applying the word “gods” to those who  
 (LXX.) *had been created, but had become partakers<sup>k</sup> of the Word,*  
 8. *as He Himself said, If He called them gods, to whom the*  
 S. John *Word of God came<sup>l</sup>.* But things which partake cannot  
 10. 35. *be the same as, nor like to, that of which they partake.*  
 Ib. 30. It was then concerning Himself that He said, *I and the*  
*Father are One*, for things brought into being are not  
 so. Or else, let those who put forward Ariminum answer  
 16. 5. 19. this question; Can a created essence say, *What I see the*  
*Father doing, that also I myself do?* For things which are  
 brought into being are things made, and not things that  
 make; for otherwise they would even have made them-  
 selves. Of course, if, as they say, the Son is a creature,  
 and the Father is His Maker, the Son would have certainly  
 also made Himself<sup>m</sup>, as being able to do what the Father  
 doeth, as He Himself said. But such a conclusion is absurd  
 and wholly untenable: for no one can make himself.

8. Again, let them say, whether things brought into  
 16. 16. being can say, *All things that the Father hath are Mine<sup>n</sup>?*  
 15. Now He “hath” the property of creating, of framing, of

<sup>i</sup> That “as” in such texts denotes not identity but resemblance, as between copy and original, see *Orat. c. Ari.* iii. 21.

<sup>k</sup> Cf. Athan. de Synod. 51, that the Son is not Son by “partaking” of the Father’s grace, as we do, but we partake of the Father by partaking of the Son; whereas he who only possesses through participation could not impart of that partaking to others, because he would have it not as his own, and it

would be merely the grace sufficient for himself. Cf. *Orat. c. Ari.* iii. 1.

<sup>l</sup> On this text see *Orat. c. Ari.* i. 39.

<sup>m</sup> The play on words cannot be preserved; *ποιούντα, καὶ γὰ ποιῶ, ποιούμενα, οὐ ποιοῦτα, ποιεῖ, ἐποίησε.* With this passage compare *Orat. c. Ari.* ii. 21; iii. 14.

<sup>n</sup> In *Orat. c. Ari.* iii. 5, this text is explained as implying that the Father is to be seen in the Son, and the Son

being eternal, of being Almighty, of being unchangeable. But things brought into being cannot have the property of framing, for they are created: nor of being eternal, for they have a beginning of existence: nor of being Almighty and unchangeable, for they are under control<sup>o</sup>, and of a changeable nature, as the Scriptures say. If then these things belong to the Son, they are plainly, as we said, no product of virtue, but belong to His essence, as the Council said, He is “not from another essence,” but from that of the Father, to which also these things properly belong. But what can that be which is proper to the Father’s essence<sup>p</sup>, and is an offspring therefrom<sup>q</sup>, or, what name can one give to it, but “Coessential<sup>r</sup>? ” For whatever things one sees in the Father, these one sees also in the Son; in the Son, not by participation, but essentially. And this is the meaning of, *I and the Father are One*, and, *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father*. And in another way, too, it is well to exhibit their senselessness<sup>s</sup>, from this point of view also: if, in your view, the Son’s likeness to the Father is a result of virtue, from which<sup>t</sup> follow the acts of willing, and not willing, and improvement of conduct, and these things are in the category of “quality,” then certainly you must say that God is made up of<sup>u</sup> quality and essence. And who will bear with you if you say this? for

in the Father, and that the Son is the proper offspring of His essence; but, to guard against a Sabellianizing misconstruction, he says, ib. 36, that the phrase “given” and “received” must be combined with it.

<sup>o</sup> Παντοκράτωρ, κρατούμενα.

<sup>p</sup> Compare Orat. c. Arian. ii. 22.

<sup>q</sup> Comp. Ath. de Deo. Nic. 21, and note there in Athan. Treat. i. 37. De Synod. 35, 41.

<sup>r</sup> See Ath. de Synodis 41 ff. to the same effect. Homoousion, he argues, means that the Son is “genuinely” the Son, not, as we are, of different nature from the Father; and that they who admit this will ere long come to accept the phrase. Epiphanius contends that it really excludes Sabellianism, and signifies δύο τέλεια which are yet inseparable, Hær. 69. 70. Comp. Hilary de Synodis 68, against false senses put upon it, e.g. a Sabellian; so de Trin. iv. 4 ff. where also he shows

that it does not detract from the truth that the Son is from the Father.

<sup>s</sup> Ἀφροσύνην. Comp. Orat. c. Arian. iii. 67, “ἀφροες and fighters against Christ.” See note in Athan. Treat. i. 2.

<sup>t</sup> <sup>u</sup> Ήσ seems required after ἀρετῆς. It could easily have dropped out.

<sup>v</sup> Σύνθετον. So in Orat. c. Ari. iv. 2, he says that if the Word were not substantive (or personal) but merely inherent in the Father, He would be like a quality existing in God, who would then be compounded of essence and quality, whereas He is indivisible. In this passage he is attacking Sabellianism; in the text, Arianism. So Basil says, “like” and “unlike” relate to qualities, whereas the Deity is free from quality. Ep. 8. 3. The argument is ad hominem, addressed to Arianizers who professed to regard the Son as “partaking” in Deity. See S. Augustine de Trin. vi. 5. 7 ff. that in the

**AD AFR.** God who has made up all things into existence, is not made up, nor is He such as are the things which were made by Him through the Word. God forbid! For He is a simple essence, in which is no quality, nor, as James says, *any variableness, nor shadow of turning.* Therefore if 1. 17. He (the Son) is shewn not to be so from virtue<sup>x</sup>, since there is no quality in God, nor in His Son, it is plain that He belongs properly to His essence: and this you will certainly admit, if intelligence has not utterly died out in you. But that which is proper to, and identical with, God's essence, and is by nature an offspring from it, what else can it be, from this point of view also but coessential with its Begetter? For this is the mark of a son in relation to a father: and he that denies this does not consider the Word to be naturally and truly a Son<sup>y</sup>.

9. It was with these thoughts in their minds that the fathers inserted in their formulary the coessentiality of the Son with the Father, and anathematized those who said that the Son was from a different "hypostasis:" not having devised words for themselves, but having themselves learnt them from the fathers who preceded them, as we said. This being thus proved, these men's "Ariminum" is superfluous: and equally superfluous is the other<sup>z</sup> council invented by them in reference to the faith. For the Nicene Council is sufficient, being in harmony also with the bishops of antiquity; that Council in which the Creed was signed by the fathers of these men, to whom it was their duty to shew respect, that they might not be considered as anything rather than Christians. But if, even after all this, and also after the testimony of the ancient bishops, and also after the signatures of their own fathers, they

Divine Nature there is the utmost simplicity; although God is called "great and wise in manifold ways," &c. yet His greatness is the same as His wisdom, &c. i. e. His attributes are not so many real parts within His Nature, but "aspects under which we men necessarily view that nature," Newman in Athan. Treatises, ii. 515. On the "simplicity" of the Divine Being see also de Synod. 34, Orat. c. Ar. i. 28: Newman's Sermons, vi. 348.

<sup>x</sup> I.e. does not derive His Sonship from His own moral perfections, as Paul of Samosata held: see below c. Apollin. i. 16; de Syn. 26; Orat. c. Ari. iii. 51. That the title "Son of God" is not simply ethical, see Lidder, Bamp. Lect. p. 10; Dorner, Person of Christ, i. 81 (E.T.)

<sup>y</sup> See Ep. Jovian. 4.

<sup>z</sup> Or "another Council." See c. 10.

pretend, as if they were ignorant, to be afraid of the phrase "Coessential," let them say, and with a simpler and truthful meaning, that the Son is by nature Son, and let them anathematize, as the Council ordered, those who say that the Son of God is a creature, or a thing made, or from things that were not in existence, or that once He was not, and that He is changeable and alterable, and of a different hypostasis: and by so doing, let them flee from the Arian heresy<sup>a</sup>. And we are confident that if in good earnest they anathematize these statements, they will forthwith confess<sup>b</sup> that the Son is "from the essence" and "coessential with the Father." For on this account the fathers, having said that the Son was coessential, forthwith added, "But those who call Him a creature, or a thing made, or, from things that were not, or say, 'once He was not,' the Catholic Church anathematizes;" that thereby they might let it be known that this is what "coessential" means<sup>c</sup>. And the force of "coessential" is understood from the fact that the Son is not a creature, nor a thing made: and that he who calls the Word "coessential" does not consider Him to be a creature, and he who anathematizes the above quoted does at the same time consider the Son to be "coessential" with the Father, and he who calls the Son of God coessential calls Him a genuine and true (Son.) And he who calls Him genuine understands the meaning of, *I and My Father are one*, and, *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father*.

10. It would indeed have been appropriate to state this at greater length: but since we are writing to you who understand the question, we have dictated it in a concise form, praying that the bond of peace may be preserved among all, and that all who belong to the Catholic Church may say and may think the same thing. And we write, not by

<sup>a</sup> So in *De Synodis*, 41, see too *Ep. Jovian*, 4. Basil says of "those who have not yet accepted the Homoousion, that one might justly blame them, and yet again deem them excusable," *Epist. 52. 1. Cp. Hilary de Synod. 71.*

<sup>b</sup> As we might say, *ipso facto*.

<sup>c</sup> As if to say, "The Church has nothing to do with any questions which <sup>the</sup>secular philosophy may raise as to the

sense of Homoousion. As she uses the term, and as you are asked to admit it, this and this only is its meaning,—That the Son is truly and Divinely Son." So untrue is the long-popular notion that, with the Homoousion, an abstruse metaphysical conception was intruded into the sphere of Christian faith. Cf. *de Syn. 51.*

AD AFR. way of instructing, but of reminding you: and it is not we only who are writing, but all the bishops in Egypt and in the Libyas, about ninety in all. For this is the one meaning we all have, and in every case we sign for each other, if any one happens to be absent. Being then thus disposed, since it happened that we all met, we have written also to our beloved Damasus, bishop of Great Rome, concerning Auxentius who invaded the church of Milan<sup>d</sup>, and have narrated his proceedings, how that he is not only a sharer in the Arian heresy, but is also chargeable with many misdeeds, which he perpetrated in conjunction with Gregory the partaker of his impiety<sup>e</sup>; and we have expressed our wonder that, up to this time, he has not been deposed and cast out of the Church; and we have returned thanks to the piety of Damasus and of those who assembled in Great Rome, inasmuch as by casting out Ursacius and Valens<sup>f</sup>, and those who thought with them, they preserved the unanimity of the Catholic Church: and wishing that this unanimity may be preserved among you also, we exhort you, as we said before, not to bear with those who, under a pretext of faith, urge the authority of a crowd of councils, that at Ariminum, that at Sirmium<sup>g</sup>, that in Isauria<sup>h</sup>, that in Thrace<sup>i</sup>, that at Constantinople<sup>k</sup>, those many and disorderly ones at Antioch<sup>l</sup>. But let that faith alone be in force among you which was confessed by the fathers at Nicæa, wherein also all, and even the fathers of those who

<sup>d</sup> Athanasius had been at Milan, probably in 343, on a summons from Constans, *Apol. ad Const.* 4. Auxentius held the see of Milan from 355 (when, after the Council of Milan, bishop Dionysius was ejected as a Catholic) to 374, when he was succeeded by S. Ambrose.

<sup>e</sup> I.e. Gregory of Cappadocia, one of the two Arians intruded into Athanasius' own see: mentioned with Auxentius in *Hist. Arian.* 74. For him see Athanasius' *Encyclical*, and *Hist. Arian.* 10, ff.

<sup>f</sup> At a Roman Council in 369, see *Tillemont*, viii. 396.

<sup>g</sup> Apparently that of 357, which framed the creed called the second Sirmian, and also the 'blasphemous,' from its virtually Anomian character; see it in *Athan. de Synod.* 28.

<sup>h</sup> The Semi-Arian council at Seleucia, in September of 359, *Athan. de Syn.* 12, *Soc.* ii. 39.

<sup>i</sup> At Nicæa in Thrace, see above, c. 4. In this creed, see *Ath. de Syn.* 30, hypostasis is proscribed as well as *ousia*. Theodoret gives this clause somewhat differently, ii. 21.

<sup>k</sup> Early in 360, after the victory of the Acæan Arians in the council of Ariminum and the submission of the Seleucian delegates, *Soz.* iv. 24. This council of Constantinople deposed the chief Semi-Arians, and imposed the creed of Nicæa and Ariminum on various Churches. See *Athan. de Synod.* 30; *Soz.* iv. 26.

<sup>l</sup> Beside the Dedication Synod of Antioch, in 341, there was one held in 358 under Eudoxius, which accepted the Sirmian 'blasphemy,' *Sozom.* iv.

now contend against it, as we said before, were present, and signed the Creed; so that of us also the Apostle may say, *Now I praise you, because you remember me in all things, and even as I delivered to you the traditions, so you hold them fast.* 1 Cor. 11. 1.

11. For this Council of Nicæa is indeed a public proscription<sup>m</sup> of every heresy. It is this also which overthrows those who blaspheme against the Holy Spirit, and call Him a creature<sup>n</sup>. For the fathers, after having spoken about the faith in the Son, forthwith added, “We believe also in the Holy Spirit;” in order that, having confessed in its perfection and fulness the faith in the Holy Trinity, they might on this point make known the character<sup>o</sup> of the faith which is in Christ, and the teaching of the Catholic Church<sup>p</sup>. For it stands out clear in your eyes, and in the eyes of all, and no Christian can have any doubt in his mind about the matter, that our faith is not in the creature, but in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, His Son, the Only begotten, and in one Holy Spirit<sup>q</sup>; one God, Him who is known in the Holy and perfect Trinity,

12. Another, in 361, placed Euzoius in the see of Antioch, and adopted an Anomœan creed.

<sup>m</sup> Στηλογραφία, as when names of offenders were placarded or posted up on pillars for public disgrace. The word is similarly used in Athan. de Synod. 34. so ib. 47, στηλιτεύοντας, and De Deer. Nic. 32, “their heresy . . . ἐστηλιτεύθη.” In De Syn. 45 Athan. calls the Homoousion a bulwark, and Liberius calls the creed an invincible bulwark, Soc. iv. 21; a council under Damasus calls it a wall and an antidote, Theod. ii. 22. Cf. Ep. Epict. 1. Basil calls it the great proclamation of true religion, Epist. 52. 1. He there remarks that it condemns Sabellianism as well as Arianism. So Epiphanius quaintly remarks that both Arius and Sabellius abhor the Homoousion, in its real sense, as a serpent hates the smell of bitumen, Hier. 69. 70. Hilary also says that the Homoousion was necessary, de Trin. iv. 7. ep. Athan. Deer. Nic. 20, “The bishops (at Nicæa), were constrained,” &c. See Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 437.

<sup>n</sup> See Tom. ad Antioch. 3. See Swete on Early History of Doctrine of Holy Spirit, p. 56, referring to this passage as a proof that in the West, as well as elsewhere, the Arians had been active in opposing the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>o</sup> Χαρακτήρα, see Keble, Acad. Serm. p. 390. Athanasius speaks of the χαρακτήρ of Scripture doctrine, Orat. iii. 29. and uses χαρακτήρα in the sense of a type or general impression, de Incarn. Verbi, 56. Compare Eusebius, iii. 38, “the χαρακτήρα of orthodoxy,” and Irenæus ap. Eusebius v. 20, “the χαρακτήρα of his life.” See also the synodal letter of Meletius and other bishops in Soc. iii. 25, “the χαρακτήρα of the true faith.”

<sup>p</sup> He assumes that the brief clause, “And in the Holy Spirit,” does virtually carry every thing, by associating the Holy Spirit as an object of faith with the Father and the Son.

<sup>q</sup> Comp. Ath. Ep. ad Serap. 1. 25. that in the Spirit the Trinity is perfect. Ib. 28; “There is then a holy and perfect Trinity, recognised as Di-

¶ **A**FR. unto which we being baptized, and in it connected with the Godhead, believe that we shall also inherit the kingdom of heaven, in Christ Jesus our Lord, through whom<sup>r</sup> to the Father be glory and dominion, for ever. Amen.

vinely existing in Father, Son and Holy Spirit.”

<sup>r</sup> Here Athan. uses one form of the doxology; “through the Son to the Father,” (see Basil de Spir. Sanct. s. 3.) as at the end of the De Synodis and the ad. Eg. Ep. At the end of his epistles to Serapion he uses a fuller,

“through whom and with whom,” (compare our first Post-Communion Prayer.) So at the end of the Hist. Arian, we read both “through” and “with the Word.” At the end of the Orations the doxology is to Christ alone.

## S. ATHANASIUS' LETTER TO EPICTETUS, BISHOP OF CORINTH.

### INTRODUCTION.

THE date of this letter may be 372, Auxentius having been condemned by a Roman Council in the latter part of 371; for Athanasius alludes to this as a very recent event, c. 1. (see Tillemont, viii. 242.)

The occasion was as follows. Epictetus, bishop of Corinth, and, as such, metropolitan of the province of Achaia, had sent to Athanasius the minutes (*ὑπομνήματα*) of a recent discussion between two parties in his diocese, who agreed in professing the Nicene faith. The opposition resembled that of which we have had an intimation in the seventh chapter of the *Tome*: except that in the present case the theory called specifically Apollinarian, as to the non-existence of a human mind in Christ, is conspicuous by its absence. One party maintained the coarser form of the Apollinarian Christology, asserting that Christ's body was not really of human origin,—that it was coessential with the Divine Word, or even that it was formed by a “conversion of His Godhead into flesh.” The other party imagined a personal separation between the Word and the Son of the Virgin, and regarded the latter as a Saint who, like one of the ancient prophets, had been chosen as the organ of the Word,—a theory which may be described as “what Nestorianism comes to” in regard to the substitution of an indwelling for an Incarnation; but although there is some difference of reading in one passage, (c. 2,) it would seem that the Corinthians in question held with Photinus the impersonality of the Word, and the distinction between the Word and the “Son,” or human Christ, whereas Nestorius believed in a personal Word who was also the Eternal Son, but who was only associated with, not personally one with, Christ the Son of Mary. Tillemont says, viii. 242, that the disputants were “persons who professed to follow the Nicene faith, but had fallen into two opposite and equally dangerous extremes.” The debate ended as such debates too seldom end. Each party abandoned its special error, and both were reunited in the twofold belief, (1) that Christ was Himself the Word Incarnate, and, (2) that His flesh was the flesh of a true humanity.

The letter in which Athanasius criticises the two errors is of remarkable interest as a specimen of his farsighted theological capacity. Epiphanius inserted it in full in his account of the Apollinarians or Dimeritae, *Haer.* 77. 3—13. It was referred to in the Council of Ephesus, as an authority against the Nestorians; two years later, John of Antioch and the “Easterns” proposed it to S. Cyril as a standard of orthodoxy and a basis of reunion (Mansi, v. 829 : ) and Cyril, while expressing his full agreement with it, tells John that “some persons have circulated it in a corrupt form,” and on that account sends him a transcript from “ancient and correct co-

pies," preserved in the library of his own church. (Ep. ad Joan. ad fin.) Theodoret, when arguing in his 'Dialogues' against the opposite disbelief of the Eutychians, finds it natural to have recourse to the same letter; and he also assures Dioscorus that he adheres to its teaching, Epist. 86. The Council of Chalcedon wrote to the Emperor Marcian, "We pride ourselves on the letter of Athanasius to Epictetus." (Mansi, vii. 464.) Leo the Great sent a copy of it to his legate, Julian of Cos, about a year after the Council, Epist. 109.

Apollinaris, it should be said, professed to Serapion of Thmuis his high approval of this letter (Leontius adv. fraud. Apoll. in Galland, xii. 701;) and Leo the Great, in the year after the Council, says that Athanasius in this letter "asserted the Incarnation so lucidly and carefully that in the heresies of his own time he already defeated Nestorius and Eutyches," (Ep. 109.)

## ATHANASIUS TO EPICTETUS.

TO MY LORD, BELOVED BROTHER, AND MUCH LONGED  
FOR FELLOW-MINISTER, EPICTETUS, ATHANASIUS SENDS  
GREETING IN THE LORD.

1. I THOUGHT, for my part, that all the vain talking of all the heretics in existence had been stopped by the Council held at Nicaea. For the faith therein confessed by the fathers, according to the Holy Scriptures, is sufficient of itself for the overthrow of all impiety, and for the establishment of the orthodox faith in Christ<sup>a</sup>. On this account accordingly, when various councils have even now been held, in Gaul and Spain and Great Rome<sup>b</sup>, all who assembled, by universal vote, as if moved by one spirit, anathematized the men who still secretly hold Arianism, I mean Auxentius at Milan, Ursacius, Valens, and Caius of Pannonia. And because those men were devising for themselves the names of councils<sup>c</sup>, they wrote to all quarters, that no council should be named in the Catholic Church, save only the Council which was held at Nicæa, and is a trophy of victory over every heresy<sup>d</sup>, but preeminently the Arian, on account of which also the Council was then assembled. How is it, then, that even after all this, some persons endeavour to stir up doubt or raise questions? If indeed they belong to the Arians, it is no wonder that they disparage the formulary drawn up against them; just as Greeks, when they hear it said that *the idols* <sup>Ps. 115.</sup> *of the heathen are silver and gold, the work of men's hands,* <sup>4.</sup> <sub>1 Cor. 1.</sub>

<sup>a</sup> Comp. ad Afros, 1, 9.

<sup>b</sup> This, the second of Damasus' councils, was held probably in 371, see Tillemont, viii. 400. A copy of its circular to the Illyrian bishops is in Mansi, Concil. iii. 459, and a Greek version in Theodoret, ii. 22.

<sup>c</sup> As we should say, 'citing the

authority of.' Cp. *διομάχω* in ad

Afros, 1, 3; Tome 4.

<sup>d</sup> Comp. ad Afros, 11. See Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 438: "It was a long, desperate struggle . . . At this day the Creed of Nicaea is the living proof of the Church's victory."

AD. EPICT. regard the teaching about the Divine Cross <sup>e</sup> as foolishness. But if the persons who wish to unsettle matters by their questioning are of the number of those who seem to believe aright, and to acquiesce and adhere <sup>f</sup> to what was promulgated by the fathers, they are simply, as Scripture says, *Hab. 2. giving their neighbour to drink of a muddy and upsetting liquor*<sup>g</sup>, and *stirring about words for no purpose except 15. LXX. 2 Tim. 2. to the subverting of the simple.*

14. 2. Now I am writing thus, after having read the minutes sent me by your Piety, which I wish had never been written, so that not even a remembrance of such things might be transmitted to posterity. For who ever yet heard such things <sup>h</sup>? who is it that has taught them, or learnt them?

Isa. 2. 3. *For out of Sion shall go forth God's law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem:* but these things, whence did they issue? What Hades vented such a saying<sup>i</sup> as that the body derived from Mary was coessential with the Godhead of the Word? or that the Word was changed into flesh <sup>k</sup>, and bones, and hair, and a whole body, and was altered from His own nature? And who ever heard in the Church or at all from Christian lips, that it was by a fiction<sup>l</sup>, not by nature, that the Lord bore about a body? or who <sup>m</sup> was ever so impious as at once to say and to think that the Godhead itself, which is coessential with the Father, was circumcised, and reduced from perfection to imperfection, and that what was nailed to the Word was not the body, but that very essence of Wisdom which formed

<sup>e</sup> Epiphanius' text has "Spirit," clearly an error.

<sup>f</sup> Or, to be content with, *ἀγαπᾶν*.

<sup>g</sup> See the Tome, 8; c. Apollin. ii. 4.

<sup>h</sup> This question is asked, in reference to Arianism, in the Encycelic of Alexander, (in Soc. i. 6,) evidently composed by Athanasius, then his deacon. The passage in the text is quoted by Theodoret, Dial. 1. (ed. Schulze, iv. p. 59.)

<sup>i</sup> So Ambrose de Inc. Dom. Saer. 49, a passage read in the first session of Chalcedon, Mansi, vi. 966, "Others start up who say that the flesh of His Lord and the Divinity are of the same nature. *Quar tantum sacrilegium inferna vomerunt?*" Apol-

linaris himself condemned it as an insanity, Leontius adv. fraud. Apoll., Galland, Bibl. xii. 701.

<sup>k</sup> Compare the "Quicunque," affirming the Unity of Christ's Person, but not in the sense of a conversion of part of the Godhead into flesh. Cp. c. Apoll. i. 3; S. Leo, Ep. 165. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Θέσει. Athanasius uses this phrase technically of an adoptive or titular sonship, de Synod. 54. Here, as in c. 7, and c. Apollin. i. 17, it means unreally, conventionally, in a way of speaking, just as "by nature" here means "really;" compare Cyril, Explan. 3, using *φυσική* for real.

<sup>m</sup> Quoted by Theodoret, Dial. iii. p. 238. Cf. Ambrose de Inc. 50.

all things<sup>n</sup>? or who<sup>o</sup>, if he heard that it was not from Mary, but, by a change, from His own essence, that the Word framed for Himself a passible body, would call him who said this a Christian? And who devised this godless impiety, so as even to come to think, and to say, that he who affirms the Lord's Body to have been from Mary conceives of a Quaternity<sup>p</sup>, instead of a Trinity, in the Godhead, as if those who are of this mind must therefore affirm that the flesh which the Saviour took from Mary and put on was of the essence of the Trinity? And from what source, again, have any persons vented an impiety equal to those already mentioned, to the effect that the body is not of more recent origin than the Godhead of the Word, but has been continuously coeternal with it, since it was composed from the essence of Wisdom? And how<sup>q</sup> have persons called Christians dared even to doubt, whether the Lord who came forth from Mary is Son of God in essence and nature, but according to the flesh is of the seed of David and the flesh of Holy Mary? And who then have become so audacious as to say, that the Christ who suffered in flesh and was crucified is not Lord, and Saviour, and God, and Son of the Father? Or how can they wish to be called Christians who say that the Word came into a holy man as into one of the prophets<sup>r</sup>, and that He was not Himself made

<sup>n</sup> Ἡ δημιουργὸς οὐσία. Cf. Ep. Adelph. 4; c. Apoll. i. 7. &c. The word "Demiurgus" had become associated with the Gnostic systems, (see Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, p. 19. &c.) but Athanasius would remember that it was used in Heb. 11. 10. He uses it freely in *de Incarn.* Verb. 1, &c. See also S. Clement, Ep. Cor. 20, &c.

<sup>o</sup> Quoted by Theodoret, *Dial.* i. p. 60.

<sup>p</sup> See Newman, *Traets Theol. and Eccles.* p. 266. The same point, "You introduce a Quaternity," i.e. Father, Son, the Man Christ, the Holy Spirit, is noticed below, c. 9, and c. Apollin. i. 9, 12, where the charge is retorted. Apollinaris, writing in 377 to the exiled bishops at Diocesarea (Leontius in Galland, xii. 707.), represents his opponents as worshiping four, God, (2) the Son of God, (3) the Son of Man, (4) the Holy Spirit, and ranking a man, in doxo-

logies, with God and the Son, before the Holy Spirit. See Tillemont, vii. 605. Gregory of Nyssa refers to this in his *Antirrheticos*, 42, and answers, "They do not serve 'a man' who bow themselves to their Lord."

<sup>q</sup> Here he turns to the opposite error. This passage was read in the first session of the Council of Ephesus, Mansi, iv. 1185. It is quoted by S. Cyril, *Apol. adv. Orient.* 163. (Pusey, p. 274,) and part of it by Leo the Great, *app. to Epist.* 165. (his "Second Tome," to the Emperor Leo, in 458.)

<sup>r</sup> See the Tome, 7, and *ad Max.* 2, and c. Apollin. i. 21, on the absurdity of saying that the Word came to Jesus as He came of old to saints or prophets. Comp. Apoll. i. 12; *Orat.* c. Ari. iii. 30. See also S. Ambrose, *de Incarn.* *Sacr.* 6. 48. See Cyril Alex. *de recta Fide ad Theod.* c. 6, (Pusey, p. 16,) that Nestorians

AD.  
EPICL.

man, having taken His body from Mary, but that the Christ was one, and the Word<sup>s</sup> of God, who before Mary and before the ages was Son of the Father, was another? Or how can they be Christians who say that the Son<sup>t</sup> is one, and the Word of God is another?

3. These opinions were stated in your minutes; differently expressed, indeed, but with one purport, and having the same meaning, impious in its tendency. On account of these opinions, dispute and discussion were going on between men who take pride in the confession of the fathers made at Nicaea. But I wonder that your Piety endured it, and did not stop those who said these things, and propound to them the true religious faith; that they might either listen and be quiet, or contradict it and be deemed heretics. For the above-mentioned opinions are neither uttered or heard among Christians, but are in every way alien from the Apostolic teaching. It is on this account that I have caused the statements of those men, as they have been already quoted, to be inserted in my letter, simply as they stand", so that any one who merely hears them may have a view of their disgraceful and impious character. And although it would have been right to impugn them at greater length, and thoroughly to expose the folly of those who have entertained such notions; yet now that my letter has reached this point, it were well to write no more; for one ought not further to work out and minutely examine opinions which have been so clearly shown to be bad, lest they should be regarded by contentious

would not have erred "if they had simply distinguished the nature of God from that of the flesh, or dwelt merely on the differences relating to this, for the nature of flesh and God-head is not the same; but their error lay in representing one as an individual man by himself, and calling another God by nature and in reality;" saying that "the Word is the Son by nature, the other (i. e. the alleged individual human Christ) is Son as being called by the same name as the Son." Again, ib. 23, p. 74, he says, "Do not make a division after the union;" . . . He lowered Himself into that which He (previously) was not; not that He should remain 'emptied,'

but that He should be believed to be God . . . not as dwelling in a man, but as having Himself really become man, without prejudice to His own glory;" and ib. 26, p. 84; "He descended into the nature of man, without lapsing from His existence as God, (but) taking to Himself what was human."

Another reading is "Τιόν, clearly a copyist's error. In the next words, Athanasius seems to mean "whom we acknowledge, although they do not, (as Photinus did not,) to have preexisted as the eternal Son." See Hefele, Hist. of Councils, sect. 71.

<sup>s</sup> The old reading was Χριστόν. But see c. 12.

<sup>t</sup> Lit. "nakedly."

persons as still matters of question, but rather to give to such statements no other reply than this, "It is enough that this is not the language of the Catholic Church, nor were the fathers of this mind." But, lest the inventors of evil things should take advantage of such absolute silence, as a warrant for further audacity, it is well to mention a few points taken from the Divine Scriptures: perhaps they may even thus be brought to shame, and may cease from holding these vile<sup>x</sup> notions.

4. Whence did it ever come into your minds, you people, to say that the body was coessential with the Godhead of the Word? For it is well to begin at this point, that when this statement is proved to be unsound, all the rest may be proved to be the like. Well, from the Divine Scriptures it is impossible to discover the ground of this statement: for they say that God became present in a human body. And further, the fathers who met at Nicæa have said, not that the body, but that the Son Himself was coessential with the Father, and they confessed that He was "from the essence of the Father," but that the body, on the other hand, was from Mary, according to the Scriptures<sup>y</sup>. Either then, disown the Nicene Council, and assert these things in the character of heretics: or if you mean to be children of the fathers, do not think contrary to the statements which they wrote down. For from this consideration also you can perceive the absurdity of your statement; if the Word is coessential with that body, which has its nature from the earth, and the Word is coessential with the Father, according to the confession of the fathers, then the Father Himself will be coessential with the body which was derived from the earth<sup>z</sup>. And then, why do you go on censuring the Arians for calling the Son a creature, when you yourselves call the Father coessential with the creatures, and, passing on to a different form of impiety, assert that the Word has been converted into flesh, and bone, and hair, and sinews, and an entire body, and had been altered from His own nature? For it is time that you

<sup>x</sup> Lit: "filthy."

Creed, but interpreting it. Cf. c.

<sup>y</sup> The original Nicene Creed did not mention S. Mary. Athanasius, therefore, is not strictly quoting the

Apoll. i. 20.

<sup>z</sup> Quoted with approval by Valentinus, a moderate Apollinarian: Leon-

AD  
EPICT.

should say plainly that He was born from earth: for from earth comes the nature of the bones and of the whole body. What means, then, this wild extravagance, which even drives you into self-contradiction? for while you call the Word coessential with the body, you indicate a comparison of the one with the other: but when you say that the Word was converted into flesh, you imagine a change<sup>a</sup> of the Word Himself. And who will any longer bear with you even when you simply utter such things? For you have gone aside into impiety to a greater extent than any heresy has done. For if the Word was coessential with the body, the mention of Mary, and the employment of her agency, were superfluous<sup>b</sup>: for the body was able to exist even before Mary, as eternal, as is also the Word Himself, since in your view He is coessential with the body. What need, then, was there for the Word to sojourn among us, in order

tius adv. fraud. Apoll., Galland. xii. 701.

<sup>a</sup> *Τροπήν.* See Epiphanius, Haer. 77, 29, that John 1, 14 implies on such “change;” as Augustine says, de Div. Quest. 83, n. 80, that in common parlance when we say, flesh becomes ashes, we mean, it ceases to be flesh,—but it is not so here; the Word became flesh, not that He was changed into, but that He took, “formam servi.” Compare Theodoret, Dial. i. Basil wrote in 377 against the Apollinarians who held that the Word in His own Godhead had been turned into a material nature, Epist. 262, Cyril of Alexandria, whom his opponents taxed with Apollinarianism, was never weary of disclaiming it. See his Ep. 2. to Nestorius (ed. Pusey, p. 4), “We do not say that the nature of the Word was altered and so became flesh, or that it was changed into whole man.” And so Ep. to John, 1, (Pusey, p. 50.) So de recta fide ad Theodos. c. 10, 9 A, Pusey, p. 28, that “the notion of a conversion of Godhead into flesh is inconsistent with the truth, that God’s nature, firmly fixed in its own good things (*ἀγαθοῖς*) and its continuance in the conditions of its being, is immovable. But a nature that is brought into being . . . in time can suffer alteration . . . For what had a beginning of existence has, so to

speak, the possibility of alteration innate in it. But God, who is above all mind, and nature, and production, and destruction, and whose being is exceptional and pre-eminent, will be also superior to change (*ἀμείνων ἔσται καὶ τροπῆς*).” Further on Cyril contrasts Godhead as enthroned “as it were on its own seat,” while men, who, “having a nature liable to change, are at all times *τρεπτοί*.” He cites Ps. 102, 17. He calls the Apollinarian notion an insanity, ib. ii. And in Ady. Orient. c. 3. (Pusey, p. 288), he says, “As for the Apollinarian doctrines, we have nothing whatever to do with them: for men who have once for all been condemned, as perverters of the truth, we are bound to avoid.” In ady. Nest. iv. 7, he says, “It is as needless to argue against a change or conversion of Godhead at the Incarnation,” as to argue that a bull is not a horse, (Pusey, p. 206). So Ady. Theodoret, 1, (Pusey, p. 396). See c. Apollin. i. 3. Card. Newman thinks that it was by way of escape from this idea of change in the Divine Nature that Apollinaris took to “denying that our Lord’s body remained human.” Tracts Theol. and Eccl. p. 271.

<sup>b</sup> Comp. c. Apollin. ii. 12. So says S. Basil, Ep. 261, “What need was there of the Holy Virgin,” &c.

that He might either put on what is coessential with Himself, or might be changed from His own nature and become body? For the Godhead does not *take hold* of itself, so that it should put on what is coessential with itself: neither, again, did the Word, who redeems the sins of others, commit sin, that, being changed into body, He might offer up Himself for Himself as a sacrifice<sup>c</sup>, and redeem Himself.

See Heb.  
2. 16.

5. No, it is not so; God forbid. For *He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham*, as the Apostle said<sup>d</sup>, *wherefore it behoved Him to be made like to His brethren in all things*, and to receive a body like to our own. It was for this purpose, then, that Mary was really provided, that He might receive this body from her, and offer it up as His own for us; and it was she whom Isaiah prophetically pointed out, saying, *Behold the Virgin: and Gabriel is sent to her, not simply to a virgin, but to a virgin espoused to a man: that by the mention of the man espousing her he might show that Mary was really a human being.* Therefore it is that Scripture mentions her bringing forth, and says, *she wrapped Him in swaddling clothes: and, the paps which He sucked were called blessed: and a sacrifice was offered on the ground that He who was brought forth had opened the womb.* Now all these things were indications of a Virgin bringing forth a child. And Gabriel announced the good news to her in language guarded from misconstruction, saying, not simply, *That which shall be born in thee*, in order that there might not be any notion of a body introduced into her from without, but, “from thee<sup>e</sup>,” that men might believe that which was to be born to be from her by nature<sup>f</sup>, while nature plainly indicates this for it, that it was impossible for a virgin to have milk unless she had borne a child, and impossible for a body to be nourished with milk, and wrapped

<sup>c</sup> Athanasius lays stress on Christ's death as a Sacrifice, in *de Incarn. Verbi*, 9; *Orat. ii. 7.* See Abp. Thomson's “Word, Work, and Will,” p. 161.

<sup>d</sup> *Comp. ad Afros. 4.*

<sup>e</sup> Lachmann brackets  $\epsilon\kappa\sigma\omega\hat{\nu}$ . Athanasius is perhaps alluding to what some Valentinians said, that *their* Jesus passed through Mary  $\kappa\alpha\theta\pi\tau\epsilon\varphi\hat{\nu}\delta\hat{\iota}\alpha\sigma\omega\hat{\nu}\nu\sigma\omega\hat{\nu}$ , *Irenaeus i. 7. 2.*

This specimen of Gnostic “spiritualism” was revived by the Anabaptists (compare the *Reformatio Legum*, p. 10) and Joan Bocher was put to death for asserting it, in 1550. Our Proper Preface for Christmas was evidently worded so as to exclude it. Cf. *de Incarn. Verbi*, 18, He fashioneth His body for Himself  $\epsilon\kappa\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\pi\omega\hat{\nu}$ .

<sup>f</sup> Cf. *e. Apollin. ii. 5.*

AD  
EPICT. in swaddling clothes, unless it had been naturally born. This is the body that was circumcised on the eighth day: this is that which Symeon took into his arms: this became a boy, and grew up, and became twelve years old, and reached its thirtieth year. For it was not, as some supposed, that the very essence of the Word was changed and circumcised, for it is immutable and unchangeable, as Mal. 3. 6. the Saviour Himself says, *Behold, behold, I am, and I* Heb. 13. 8. *change not*<sup>g</sup>: and Paul writes, *Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever*: but in that body which was circumcised, and carried about, and which ate and drank, and laboured, and was nailed to the tree and suffered, there dwelt the impassible and incorporeal Word of God. This body was that which was laid in the tomb, 1 S. Pet. 3. 19. when *He went* (not that He was parted from it<sup>h</sup>) *to preach also to the spirits in prison*, as Peter said<sup>i</sup>.

6. And this gives a complete proof of the folly of those who say that the Word was changed into bones and flesh. For if that were so, there would have been no need of a sepulchre: for the body would have gone by its own power to preach to the spirits in Hades. But now He Himself went to preach, but the body was wrapt by Joseph in linen, and deposited in Golgotha<sup>k</sup>: and it was made clear to all that the body was not the Word, but was the Word's body. And it was this body which, after it had risen from the dead, Thomas handled<sup>l</sup>, and saw in it the print of the nails which the Word Himself endured when He saw them fixed into His own body, and, when He could have hindered them, hindered them not, but appropriated<sup>m</sup> to Him-

<sup>g</sup> Athanasius seems here to mix up S. Luke 24. 39 with Mal. 3. 6.

<sup>h</sup> Μὴ χαρισθεῖς αὐτῷ is not found in all MSS., nor in Epiphanius, and may very likely have been a gloss, intended to guard the truth that the "Personal Union" was never for an instant broken: c. Apollin. ii. 15.

<sup>i</sup> See this text paraphrased, c. Apollin. ii. 8.

<sup>k</sup> See S. John 19. 41.

<sup>l</sup> Ep. ad Max. 2: and see S. Cyril Alex. de recta fide ad Theod. c. 42. (Pusey, p. 144) that Thomas spoke after "measuring" with his finger

the side, and the wound-prints of the nails.

<sup>m</sup> Ἐδιαποιεῖτο, a favourite phrase of Athanasius: see de Incarn. Verbi, 8, "He . . . appropriates the body;" ib. 31: and Orat. c. Arian. iii. 33, "The Word having appropriated the affections of the flesh;" and ib. iii. 38. See below, c. Apollin. i. 12, 13. It is adopted by Cyril of Alex. Apol. adv. Orient. 12 (Pusey, p. 372). Comp. Ep. ad Nest. 2, "He made our body θεῖον." It is equivalent to οἰκεῖον σθαῖ, c. Apollin. ii. 16.

self what belonged to the body as belonging to Himself, the incorporeal Word. Thus, when the body was being struck by the officer, He said as if Himself suffering, *Why smitest thou Me?*<sup>8. John 18. 22.</sup> and although the Word was by nature intangible, nevertheless He said, *I gave My back to scourges, and My cheeks to buffets, and I turned not away My face from shameful spitting.* For<sup>n</sup> what the human body of the Word was suffering, this the Word, being present with it, referred to Himself, that we might be enabled to partake of the Godhead<sup>o</sup> of the Word. And it was a marvel<sup>p</sup> that He was the one suffering and not suffering: suffering, because that body suffered which was His own, and He was in it while it suffered<sup>q</sup>: yet not suffering, because the Word, being by nature God, is impassible<sup>r</sup>. And the incorporeal One Himself was present in the passible body, and the body had in itself the impassible Word, who was abolishing the infirmities of the body itself. And this He was doing, and thus it came to pass, in order that He, receiving what was ours, and offering it up in sacrifice, might abolish it<sup>s</sup>, and thereafter might clothe us with what was His, and cause the Apostle to say, *This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.*<sup>1Cor. 15. 53.</sup>

<sup>n</sup> Quoted by Theodoret, Dial. iii. p. 238. Cf. de Incarn. Verbi, 18: Orat. c. Ari. iii. 31, 32.

<sup>o</sup> Perhaps an allusion to 2 Pet. 1. 4.  
<sup>p</sup> Παράδοξον. On these "paradoxes of the Incarnation, dear to faith," (Dorner) comp. Ath. c. Apollin. i. 11. See too Hippolytus c. Noet. 18: Hilary de Trinit. ii. 25: the "Clementine Liturgy" in Hammond's Liturgies East. and West. p. 7: Greg. Naz. Orat. 29. 19, Epist. 101: Greg. Nyssen, quoted by Cyril Alex. Apol. adv. Orient. c. 12: and other passages, quoted ib. 4: see also Chrysostom quoted by Cyril ad Arcadiani, &c. 49. A. (Pusey, p. 165): the Sermon of Proclus on the Incarnation, 9: Cyril himself, Quod unus sit Christus, (Pusey, p. 357): Augustine, Serm. 191; the Tome of Leo, 5: and extracts in Athanasian Treatises, vol. ii. p. 440. Oosterzee says, "For him who denies either the Eternal Godhead or the true Humanity of the Lord,

such antitheses are nothing but unmeaning sounds," Image of Christ, p. 220 E. T.

<sup>q</sup> That He "suffered and did not suffer" (as S. Ambrose says, de Incarn. Dom. Sacr. 36), is repeated in c. Apollin. i. 11. Comp. Cyril, Quod unus sit Christus, 766. A. Pusey, p. 407: it being asked, how could the self-same both suffer and not suffer? he answers, Being impassible as God, He assumed passible flesh and made it His own, that the suffering might be called His, because it was His body and not another's that suffered. Hence it was "God's body," c. Apoll. i. 10. So Newman, Serm. vi. 74: "That face, so ruthlessly smitten, was the face of God Himself," &c.

<sup>r</sup> So Cyril calls him "the impassible one," Ep. ad Nest. 2.

<sup>s</sup> I.e. offering it up as mortal, might thus secure man's release from death, de Incarn. Verbi, 8.

AD  
EPICT.S. Luke  
24. 39.  
40.

7. And this took place<sup>t</sup>, not by a fiction, as some have thought, God forbid! but the Saviour having really and in truth become man, salvation was effected for the whole of man. For if, as they say, it was by a fiction that the Word was in the body, and what is said to be by a fiction is merely imaginary<sup>u</sup>, then the so-called salvation and resurrection of men is found to take place only in semblance<sup>x</sup>, as according to the impious Manichæus<sup>y</sup> held. But indeed, our salvation is no imagination; nor is it the body only, but the whole man<sup>z</sup>, soul and body in truth, that has attained to salvation in the Word Himself. So then that which was derived from Mary was by nature human<sup>a</sup>, according to the Divine Scriptures: and the body of the Lord was real: but it was real because it was the same as our own<sup>b</sup>: for Mary was our sister, since we are all from Adam. And this no one can doubt, who remembers what Luke wrote. For after He rose again from the dead, when some thought that they were not seeing the Lord in the body derived from Mary, but were beholding a spirit instead of Him, He said, *Behold My hands and My feet, and the prints of the nails<sup>c</sup>, that it is I Myself; handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have: and when He had thus said, He shewed unto them His hands and His feet.* Whereby also they can be refuted who have dared to say that the Lord was changed into flesh and bones. For He said not, As ye see Me “being” flesh and bones, but, “having” them, in order that the Word Himself might not be thought to have been con-

<sup>t</sup> Read at the Council of Ephesus, Mansi, iv. 1185.

is referred to, c. Apoll. i. 3. Cf. S. Aug. Confess. Lib. Fath. p. 325.

<sup>u</sup> Φαντασία. See c. Apollin. i. 3, 16.

<sup>x</sup> Δοκήσει, Ep. ad Adelph. 2. See c. Apollin. i. 2, 3; ii. 12. So Basil says,

“This impious notion τοῦ δοκήσεως is not of such recent date,” Epist. 261, 2. See Cyril Alex. de recta fide ad Theodos. c. 9. (Pusey, p. 22) that if our Lord’s Manhood were not real, all Christian faith would become unreal: (just as Tertullian had contended against the early “Docetism,” ady. Marc. iii. 8; so S. Irenæus, iv. 33; see also Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. iv. 9, xiii. 37.)

<sup>y</sup> Quoted by Theodoret, but laxly, Dial. i. p. 80.

<sup>z</sup> That is to say, Deny Christ’s Body to be of human origin, and you fall inevitably into Docetism. Some fifty years before, Athanasius had written, “He takes to Himself a body, and that body not alien to our own,” De Incarn. Verbi, 8. Cf. S. Basil, Ep. 261.

<sup>c</sup> Here he mixes up part of S. John 20, 25 with his quotation from S. Luke.

<sup>a</sup> I.e. Manes. Manichean Docetism

verted into them, but might be believed to be Himself possessed of them, both before His death and after His resurrection.

8. These points being thus proved, it is superfluous to proceed to touch on the others, and treat of them at all; since the body, in which the Word was, was not coessential with the Godhead, but truly born of Mary: and the Word Himself was not converted into bone and flesh. For what is said by John, *The Word became flesh*<sup>d</sup>, has this meaning, as indeed we can ascertain this from language which is like it: for it is written in Paul, *Christ became a curse for us*<sup>e</sup>. And as He did not Himself become a curse, but is said to have become a curse because He took on Himself the curse for us: so also He became flesh, not by being changed into flesh, but because He assumed living flesh for us<sup>f</sup>, and became man. For to say, *The Word became flesh*, is just the same as to say, "The Word became man<sup>g</sup>," according to the text in Joel, *I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh*: for the promise did not extend to the irrational animals, but is addressed to men, for whose sake also the Lord became man. Such, then, being the meaning of this expression, all those persons will with good reason be self-condemned who have thought that the flesh which came from Mary existed before her, and that before her the Word had a kind of human soul<sup>h</sup>, and had always existed in it before He came to sojourn in

<sup>d</sup> Quoted by Theodoret, Dial. i. Anath. 5. See Greg. Naz. Epist. 101. p. 43.

<sup>e</sup> So in Orat. c. Ari. ii. 47. that He took on Him the curse which we had incurred. Comp. Cyril Alex. Quod unus sit Christus, 719 A. Pusey, p. 341. that He became a curse by being reckoned among sinners, and that this presupposes His having become Man.

<sup>f</sup> According to this, the expression, A became B, or A is B, would mean that A took to himself or itself B, or B was superadded to A.

<sup>g</sup> Strictly, however, this is another explanation of σὰρξ ἐγένετο, unless "man" is used in the sense of manhood. Comp. Athan. Orat. c. Arian. iii. 30. "became flesh" explained as "becoming man." So Cyril, Explan.

<sup>s. John 1. 14.</sup>

<sup>Gal. 3. 13.</sup>

<sup>Joel 2. 28.</sup>

"If they insist on 'the Word became flesh' . . . and on that account scrape away the noblest part of man (as shoemakers do with the thicker part of their leather) that they may glue together God and flesh," &c. He cites John 17. 2, Ps. 65. 3, 145. 21, to show that flesh is put by synecdoche for man. He compares "Christ was made sin" or "a curse," in that He took on Him "sin," and, a "curse." In Theodoret's first Dialogue, Eranistes objects to Orthodox for interpreting "Lecame" by "assumed."

<sup>h</sup> Dorner says that Apollinaris viewed the Word as the eternal archetype of humanity. Person of Christ, i. 2. 372.

**AD  
EPICRT.** the world. And they too will be silenced who have said that the flesh was not capable of death<sup>1</sup>, but that it was of an immortal nature. For if He did not die, how was it that Paul delivered to the Corinthians *that which also he received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures?* And how did He at all *rise again*, unless He had died? And they will be put to confusion who have even entertained the thought, that if the body were said to be from Mary, a Quaternity would be substituted for the Trinity: “for,” they say, “if we call the body coessential with the Word, the Trinity remains a Trinity, for the Word does not introduce anything foreign into it; but if we say that the body which came from Mary was human, then, since the body is essentially foreign (to the Word,) and the Word is in the body, a Quaternity is necessarily substituted for a Trinity on account of the addition of the body.”

9. When they say this, they do not consider how they contradict themselves. For even if they say that the body was not from Mary, but was itself coessential with the Word, not the less will they herein be proved to be, on their own shewing, asserting a Quaternity, the very point on which they hypocritically insist, apparently lest they should be supposed to hold such opinions. For as the Son, being, according to the fathers, coessential with the Father, is not Himself the Father, but is called a coessential Son, in regard to the Father<sup>k</sup>; so the “coessential body of the Word” is not the Word Himself, but is different from the Word: and since it is different, then on their shewing *their* Trinity will be a Quaternity<sup>l</sup>: for it is not the true and really perfect and undivided Trinity which receives an addition, but only the Trinity conceived of by them. And how can they be any longer Christians, since

<sup>1</sup> On the naturally mortal character of our Lord's Body, see Athan. *Orat. c. Arian.* ii. 66, that to the body (i. e. as assumed by Him) death belonged, (see note in loc. Athan. *Treat.* ii. 375) and ib. iii. 56, that He assumed a body by nature mortal. This was afterwards denied by the Aphthartodocetie, in whose error Justinian died.

They were a section of the Monophysites; they insisted on Acts 2. 27, wrongly inferring from it (see Leontius, in Galland, xii. 679) that Christ's body was of itself not liable either to death or to wear and tear.

<sup>k</sup> So Hilary de Trin. iv. 6.

<sup>l</sup> Compare c. Apollin. i. 9.

they conceive of a different God from the existing God? For, again, even in that other sophism of theirs one may discern the greatness of their folly. For if<sup>m</sup>, because it stands written in the Scriptures that the Saviour's body was from Mary and was human, they think that a Quaternity is asserted instead of a Trinity, on the ground that an addition takes place on account of the body, they go far astray by placing the thing made on a footing of equality with the Maker, and imagining that the Godhead can receive an addition: and they know not that it was not for the sake of an addition to the Godhead that the Word became flesh, but that the flesh might rise again: nor was it for the Word's own improvement that He came forth from Mary, but that He might redeem the race of men. How then can they think that the body, redeemed and quickened through the Word, can make any addition to the Godhead of the Word who redeemed it? On the contrary, the human body itself has received a great addition by the Word's fellowship and union with it: for instead of mortal, it has become immortal; and whereas it was animal<sup>n</sup>, it has become spiritual; and whereas it came from the earth, it has passed through the doors of heaven. But the Trinity, even now that the Word received a body from Mary, is a Trinity, not receiving addition or diminution, but is ever perfect, and in Trinity is acknowledged one Godhead<sup>o</sup>, and so in the Church is proclaimed one God, the Father of the Word<sup>p</sup>.

10. From this consideration they also will henceforward be silenced who have ever said that He who came forth from Mary was not Himself the Christ and Lord and God<sup>q</sup>.

<sup>m</sup> Quoted by Theodoret, *Dial. ii.* p. 137.

<sup>n</sup> Ψυχικόν, unspiritual, as in S. Paul's use, 1 Cor. 2. 14; 15. 44.

<sup>o</sup> Compare Tom. I. ad Afr. 11.

<sup>p</sup> The Father being the "fount of Godhead." On the sense in which the Father is called "the only true God" &c. see Newman's *Arians*, p. 180, and *Athanas. Treatises* i. 45. This is the principle of the 'Monarchia.' It is represented by the language of the *Te Deum*; and *Gregory of Nazianzus*, while ardently insisting on the reality

of the Trinity, speaks of It in this sense, as "recapitulated into Unity," *Orat. 6. 22*. Compare Liddon, *Bamp. Lect. p. 422*; and Newman's *Sermons*, vi. 58, "The great safeguard to the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity is the doctrine of His Sonship." And again, *ib. vi. 358*, "First we read that God is one; next, that He has an Only-begotten Son; further, that this . . . Son . . . the Word . . . is God."

<sup>q</sup> He now turns to the theory of an association between the Divine Word and a merely human Christ, and in

AD  
EPICR.  
S. MATT.  
1. 23.

ROM. 9.  
5.

S. JOHN  
20. 28.  
1 COR.  
2. 8.

For, if He was not God in a body, how was it that at once after He had proceeded from Mary, He was *called Emmanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us?* or how, if the Word was not in the flesh, did Paul write to the Romans, *of whom is Christ according to the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever<sup>1</sup>, Amen?* Let them therefore who have formerly denied the Crucified to be God, acknowledge their error, yielding to the divine Scriptures, and especially to Thomas, who, after seeing in Him the prints of the nails, cried out, *My Lord and my God<sup>2</sup>!* For the Son<sup>3</sup> being God, and *Lord of glory*, was in that body which was ignominiously pierced with nails, and treated with dishonour: and the body suffered indeed, when it was pierced on the wood, and from its side flowed blood and water; yet, being the temple of the Word, it continued to be filled with the Godhead. On this account, then, the sun seeing its Maker endure this in the body which was being outraged, contracted its rays, and darkened the earth; and the body itself, having a mortal nature, transcended its own nature by rising again, because of the Word present in it; and its natural power of corruption was arrested, and having put on the super-human Word, it became incorruptible.

11. And as to the imagination of those who say, that as the Word came to each of the prophets<sup>4</sup>, so too He came

effect supplies materials for the refutation of Nestorianism, as in c. Apollin. i. 12. So does Epiphanius in an admirable passage of Haer. 77, 39; beginning with a disclaimer of "two Christs," he goes on, "The selfsame was God and man. Not as if He dwelt in a man, but that He Himself became man wholly. Not that He was a man who was advanced to Godhead," &c.

<sup>1</sup> "God blessed for ever," in this text, is understood by Athanasius of "Christ," see c. Apollin. i. 10; Orat. c. Arian. i. 10, 11, 24; iv. 1; Ep. ad Serap. i. 28. See Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 313.

<sup>2</sup> Greg. Naz. urged that He was really in flesh after His Resurrection, else He could not have been handled. Epist. 101.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Theodoret, Dial. iii. p. 239.

<sup>4</sup> See on the Tome, c. 7. Hilary notices this theory in de Trin. x. 21, and adds, "Cum ipse ille Filius hominis ipse sit qui et Filius Dei, quia totus hominis Filius totus Dei Filius sit: quam ridicule prater Dei Filium qui Verbum caro factum est, alium nescio quem tanquam prophetam Verbo Dei animatum praedicabimus?" Cyril, adv. Orient. c. 1. (Pusey, p. 276.) censures "those who say that the Word came into a holy man, as into one of the prophets, but that the Christ and the Word of God, who was the Father's Son before the ages, were different from each other." See Cyril, "Quod unus sit Christus," 751. (Pusey, p. 386.) Nestorians endeavoured to meet the objection, "You make the relation between God and Christ ejusdem generis with that between God and one of the Prophets," by saying that Christ had in fulness

to a certain man born of Mary, it is superfluous to examine it, for this wild notion of theirs carries its confutation on its face. For if it was in this sense that He came, why was this Man born of a Virgin, and not himself also of man and woman? For it was in this latter way that each of the saints was born. Or why, if it was thus that the Word came, is not the death of every saint said to have taken place "for us," but only the death of this Man? And why, if the Word sojourned with each one of the prophets, is it said in regard to Mary's Son alone, that He sojourned *once* <sup>Heb. 9.</sup> *at the completion of the ages?* Or why, if He came as He <sup>26.</sup> came in the saints of former times, did not all those others rise again after death? Why was it Mary's Son alone, that rose again the third day? Or why, if the Word came just as He came to the rest, is Mary's Son alone called Emmanuel, in that she had given birth to a body filled with Godhead? For Emmanuel signifies *God with us.* Or why, if it was thus that He came, is not He Himself spoken of as eating and drinking, and labouring, and dying, in the case of every saint who ate and drank, and laboured, and died, and not solely in the case of Mary's Son? For what His body suffered is spoken of as if He Himself suffered it<sup>x</sup>. And whereas of all the others it is only said that they were born and died, of Mary's Son only it is said, *And the Word became flesh.*

12. Whence it appears that to all the others the Word came in order that they should prophesy: but from Mary the Word Himself took flesh and came forth as Man, being in His nature and His essence<sup>y</sup> the Word of God, but ac-

what they had in measure: Cyril replies, that on this view Christ excels the prophets simply "in quantity of grace," &c. Compare note on the Tome, c. 7.

<sup>x</sup> This is the "antidosis" or "communicatio idiomatum," (to use technical phrases,) consequent on the personal union of Godhead and Manhood in the one Christ. See S. Tho. Aquin. Sum. 3. 16. 4, 5; Hooker, v. 53. 4; Pearson on Creed, (art. 4.) vol. i. p. 328; Athanasian Treatises, ii. 443, note; Bp. Forbes on Nicene Creed, p. 206; Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 258. All the titles or properties which be-

long respectively to His Godhead or His Manhood are predicated of His One Person, who is both God and Man. Therefore those which belong to manhood may be freely ascribed to Him as God, and those which belong to Godhead may be ascribed to Him as Man. The "communicatio" consists merely in this, that they all belong to the same Person. See above, c. 6. In the text Athanasius clearly admits that the Word Himself did in His humanity "labour and die."

<sup>y</sup> On the Athanasian use of *οὐραία* and *φύσις* for our Lord's Divine nature see Newman, Ath. Treat. ii. 345,

Ad  
 ERIC<sup>t</sup>: cording to the flesh made man<sup>z</sup>, from *the seed of David*  
 Rom. 1.  
 3. and the flesh of Mary, as Paul said. This is He whom the  
 Father manifested, saying at the Jordan and on the moun-  
 S. Matt. tain, *This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased.*  
 3. 17.  
 Ib. 17. 5. This is He whom the Arians have denied, but we recognize  
 and worship, not dividing the Son and the Word, but  
 knowing that the Word Himself is the Son<sup>a</sup>, through whom  
 all things were made and we were redeemed. Therefore  
 we wondered how any controversy at all rose up among  
 you as to things so manifest. But thanks to the Lord, in  
 proportion to the pains which we felt in reading your mi-  
 nutes, was our pleasure when we came to the end. For  
 the parties separated in agreement with each other, and  
 were at peace in the confession of the pious and orthodox  
 faith. And this fact has persuaded me, after I had pre-  
 viously considered the matter at length, to write this short  
 letter; for I took account of this, that possibly my silence  
 might cause pain instead of joy to those who by their  
 agreement gave us occasion for rejoicing. So I beg your  
 Piety in the first place, and the hearers in the second, to  
 accept this letter with a good feeling, and if there be there-  
 in anything defective as to true religion, to correct it and  
 to inform me. And if it has been written otherwise than  
 the subject demands, or in an imperfect way, as by a man  
*unskilled in speech*, I beg that all will excuse my rudeness  
 as to speaking<sup>b</sup>.

2 Cor.  
11. 6.

Salute all the brethren who are with you. All those  
 who are with us salute you. May you live in health in the  
 Lord, beloved and truly longed-for.

Tracts Theol. and Ecol. p. 305 ff. Yet  
 a human *φύσις* is admitted in Orat. c.  
 Ari. iii. 53.

<sup>t</sup> Theodoret repeatedly asserts his  
 belief in this Personal Unity. So he  
 writes to Renatus, a Roman presbyter;  
 "I know no other Son of God than  
 Him who is Son of Man," Epist. 116.  
 So Ep. 99, that he is calumniated as  
 if he did not believe in the Unity of  
 Christ while enforcing the distinction  
 between flesh and Godhead; so in Ep.  
 104, he assures Flavian of Constanti-  
 nople that while he maintains the

Union to involve no confusion, he  
 adores Christ as one Son even after  
 the Incarnation.

<sup>a</sup> Here he seems to allude to the  
 Marcilian and Photinian notion that  
 the Word was not the Son from eter-  
 nity; that the Sonship belonged to  
 the man Jesus as the special organ of  
 the Word. See c. 2.

<sup>b</sup> In Ep. ad Serap. i. 33, he alludes  
 to some who called his argument,  
 "poor and weak." So in his Ep. ad  
 Monachos 1, 3, he calls himself weak  
 by nature and unlearned.

## ATHANASIUS' LETTER TO ADELPHIUS.

### INTRODUCTION.

CERTAIN Arians, it appears, had gradually come to deny the existence of a human soul in the Christ: according to them, a created "Divinity" filled its place: and they contended that on no other supposition could adoration be due to Christ's Humanity. "If," they said, "you hold that He has our humanity in its complete form, your worship of Him must be idolatrous:" not seeing that the Catholics adored Him as a Divine Person who had assumed Manhood, and that they, with their belief in the unreality of His Godhead, could make out no case for adoring Him at all.

Athanasius wrote on this subject to Adelphius, bishop of Onuphis, who had sat in the Council of Alexandria, after his return from his place of exile in the Thebaid, Hist. Ari. 72, and who after Athanasius' death was one of eleven bishops banished by Valens to Diocæsarea<sup>a</sup>. (Epiph. Hær. 72. 11.) The letter is very explicit on the adoration due to Christ's Humanity as inseparable from His Divine Person: and by its teaching, say the Benedictines, Athanasius plainly "condemns both Nestorius and Eutyches, long before the rise of their respective heresies; Nestorius, by saying that "Christ is not to be divided into two: and Eutyches, by maintaining the "nature of Christ to be entire and distinct." Cf. Tillemont, viii. 172.

The date of the letter is about 371.

## ATHANASIUS TO ADELPHIUS.

1. HAVING read what your Piety has written, we sincerely approved your piety towards Christ. In the first place we glorified God, who had given you so much grace as to have a right judgment, and also, as far as possible, *not to be ignorant of the devices of the devil*: in the next place we marvelled at the perversity of the heretics, seeing how they have fallen so far into a pit of impiety as no longer even to preserve their perceptions, but to have their minds corrupted at every point. Now this attempt

<sup>a</sup> Here they received a letter from some clerics of Marcellus, and were also for a time deceived by the professions of Apollinaris, so that Adelphius and another wrote in his favour;

but afterwards they wrote against him (see Facundus pro Defens. iv. 2) and received a letter of thanks from S. Basil, Epist. 265.

AD  
ADELPHI.ROM. 1.  
30.2 TIM. 3.  
8.PS. 82.  
5.

is at once a suggestion of the devil, and an imitation of the wicked Jews. For as they, when convicted on every point, devised pretexts to their own ruin, so as simply to deny the Lord, and draw down on themselves the evils which had been predicted; in the same way also these men, seeing themselves held up to obloquy on all sides, and observing that their heresy has become abhorred by all men, become *inventors of evil things*, so that by not desisting from their fightings against the truth, they may remain in truth fighters against Christ. For whence has this mischief also sprung up among them? How is it that they have at all dared to utter this new insult against the Saviour? But, as it seems, the impious man is a wicked creature, and really *reprobate concerning the faith*. For formerly, while denying the Godhead of the Only-begotten Son of God, they pretended that at any rate they acknowledged His coming in the flesh;<sup>b</sup> but now, taking a downward course little by little, they have fallen away from even this opinion of theirs, and are become godless at all points, so as neither to recognize Him as God, nor to believe that He became Man. For had they believed this, they would not have uttered such things as your Piety has written down to their condemnation.

2. You indeed, O beloved and truly longed for, have acted in accordance with the Church's tradition and with piety towards the Lord, by confuting, exhorting, and rebuking men like these. But since, being stimulated by their father the devil, they, as the Scripture says, *have not known nor understood, but walk on in darkness*, let them learn from your Piety that such misbelief as theirs comes from Valentinus and Marcion and Manichaeus<sup>c</sup>: some of

<sup>b</sup> Τὴν Ἐνσαρκοῦ παρουσίαν. A "very frequent phrase" with Athanasius, see Athan. Treat. Lib. Fath. i. 252; note on Orat. c. Arian. i. 49; and below c. 6, 8. Cyril of Jerusalem uses it for the first Advent in Catech. xii. 15, for Christ's Humanity in iii. 11. Epiphanius uses it for Christ's Humanity, Hier. 77, 18, 19, 32; for His life as man, ib. 77, 26.

<sup>c</sup> See c. Apollin. i. 12, and cf. Epiphani. Hier. 77, 25. Theodoret

copies this: when Eranistes says that the Word did not assume flesh, Orthodox answers, "As far as I see, we have to contend against partisans of Valentinus, and Marcion, and Manes," Dial. i. p. 29. It became usual to call the Eutychians followers of Valentinus, see Fleury, b. 29, c. 29; Gore's Leo the Great, p. 60, in series of "The Fathers for English Readers."

whom brought in the notion of “semblance<sup>d</sup>” instead of reality, and others, dividing what cannot be divided, denied that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us. Why then, since they think with those men, do they not also take up the inheritance of their names? For it is reasonable that they should bear the names of those whose error they hold, so as to be hereafter called Valentinians and Marcionites and Manicheans; and perhaps in that case they might be brought to shame by the ill-sounding appellations, and enabled to see into what a depth of impiety they have fallen. And it would be but just to give them no further answer, according to the Apostle’s exhortation, *A heretic after a first and second admonition reject, knowing that such a one is subverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned*: especially because the Prophet also says of such persons, *The fool will speak foolish things, and his heart will imagine vain things*. But since, after the example of their leader, they themselves also go about like lions, seeking whom among the simple they may devour, it has therefore become necessary for us to reply to your Piety, that the brethren, being again instructed by your admonition, may condemn yet more fully the vain talking of these men.

3. We do not “worship a creature<sup>e</sup>;” God forbid! for such error as that belongs to Heathens<sup>f</sup> and to Arians<sup>g</sup>; but

<sup>d</sup> Δηκησις, comp. Ep. ad Epict. 7; c. Apollin. i. 3; ii. 12; see Orat. c. Arian. ii. 70, “He took true flesh, though Valentinus may rave.”

<sup>e</sup> The persons in question argued, “If you ascribe to the Christ, whom you adore, a really human nature, you invest that humanity with the quality of adorableness, and in this sense you worship a creature.” So Greg. Naz. intimates that the Apollinarians called the Catholics Man-worshippers, Epist. 101. He himself says, “If any one does not worship the Crucified, let him be anathema, and ranked with the Deicides,” ib. See c. Apollin. i. 21. The passage in the text is also translated in Dr. Pusey’s Lenten Sermons, p. 440, and his Letter to Bp. Blomfield, p. 157.

<sup>f</sup> See Cyril Alex. de recta fide ad Theod. 31. (Pusey, p. 98.) that if men

worshipped Emmanuel as a mere man, they would fall into Heathenish idolatry: (alluding to the then prevalent notion that many of the Pagans’ gods were deified men, Athan. c. Gentes, 9.)

<sup>g</sup> The Arian worship of the Son, considered as a creature, though the eldest and highest of creatures, was formal idolatry, as the Fathers repeatedly urged. E. g. Athan. Ep. Aeg. 13; Hist. Ari. 80; de Syn. 50, Orat. c. Ari. i. 8; iii. 16. So Epiphanius tersely argues, “If He is not true God, He is not adorable; and if He is created, He is not God. And if He is not adorable, why is He called Divine (θεολογεῖται)? Cease then, you who have again set up the image of Nebuchadnezzar!” Haer. 69. 31. See too Peter in Theod. iv. 22, that Arians worship “a new God,” (alluding to

**AD ADELPHI.** worship the Lord of creation as Incarnate, the Word of God. For although the flesh, considered by itself, is a portion of the things created, yet it has become God's Body<sup>h</sup>. And we neither divide this body, being such, from the Word, and worship it by itself; nor do we, while wishing to worship the Word, set Him far off from the flesh. But, knowing, as we said before, that the Word became flesh, so do we recognize Him as God even although He came to exist in flesh. Who, then, is so senseless as to say to the Lord, "Withdraw from the body, that I may worship Thee<sup>i</sup>?" or who is so impious as to say to Him, with the senseless Jews, on account of the body, *Wherefore dost Thou, being a man, make thyself God?* But not such was the mind of the leper; for he worshipped God as existing in a body, and knew that it was God, saying, *Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean.* And he neither, because of the flesh, deemed the Word of God to be a creature, nor did he, because the Word was the Framer<sup>k</sup> of all creation, set at nought the flesh which He had put on; but he worshipped the Creator of the universe as in a created temple,—

**Ib. 9. 20.** and he was cleansed. So too the woman with the issue of blood, after believing, and simply touching the hem of

**Ib. 8. 26.** His garment, was healed; and the sea with its foaming billows listened to the Word Incarnate, and ceased from its raging: and the man blind from birth was healed by the Word with the spittle of His flesh. And, what is greater and more astonishing, (for this perhaps has caused those

**LXX Ps. 80.9).** See other quotations in Mozley on Theory of Development, p. 74: and ib. p. 78, "Idolatry could not attach to the Arian idea in its application: for as far as our Lord was the object of their worship, they were not idolatrous. It attached to it in its substance. The position was in itself an idolatrous one. It supposed a being who was not to be supposed," &c.

<sup>h</sup> Cf. Epict. 6; Max. 2; c. Apollin. i. 6, 10, 18; ii. 14; see Orat. c. Arian, ii. 61; and ib. iii. 31, "though He was God, He had a body of His own." Cyril Alex. claims "our blessed father Athanasius as saying that the body of Christ was the Word's own body, but born of a woman akin to our own;"

Apol. adv. Orient. 11, (Pusey, p. 373.) Because He whose body it was, since He had assumed it, was no other than God the Word, therefore it was "God's Body." Cyril quoted this for the Personal Union, the identity of the Christ with the Eternal Son, as opposed to the (Nestorian) idea of an association, exceptionally close, between the Son of God and a personally human Christ. Apollinaris misused this expression as if "God's flesh" were equivalent to "God," Galland, xii. 704.

<sup>i</sup> Epiphanius, in 374, imitated this, "Let no one, then, say to the Only-begotten, 'Lay aside the body, that I may adore Thee.' " Ancorat. 51.

<sup>k</sup> Δημιουργός. Cf. c. 4: ad Afros, 5.

**S. John 10. 33.**

**S. Matt. 8. 2.**

**Ib. 9. 20.** and he was cleansed. So too the woman with the issue of blood, after believing, and simply touching the hem of

**Ib. 8. 26.** His garment, was healed; and the sea with its foaming billows listened to the Word Incarnate, and ceased from its

**S. John 9. 6.** raging: and the man blind from birth was healed by the Word with the spittle of His flesh. And, what is greater and more astonishing, (for this perhaps has caused those

most impious men to stumble:) even when the Lord was hanging on the Cross itself, (for the body was His, and in it was the Word) *the sun was darkened, and the earth trembled, the rocks rent, and the veil of the temple was rent, and many bodies of the saints who slept arose*<sup>1</sup>.

S. Luke 23. 45.  
S. Matt. 27. 51.

4. Now these things did take place, and no one doubted, as now the Arians dare to do, whether it was right to trust the Word Incarnate: but even while seeing a man, they recognized Him as being their Maker; and while hearing a human voice, they did not say, on account of what was human, that the Word was a creature, but rather trembled, and none the less acknowledged Him than if He were speaking out of a holy temple. How then is it that the impious men do not fear lest, *as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, they may be delivered to a reprobate mind, to do the things that are not befitting?* For the creature does not worship a creature<sup>m</sup>: nor again did it, on account of the flesh, decline to worship its own Creator: but it saw its own Maker in a body, and *in the Name of Jesus Christ every knee bowed*, and what is more, *will bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; and every tongue shall confess*, even though it may not please the Arians, *that Jesus Christ is the Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* For the flesh brought no dishonour to the Word, God forbid! but rather has itself been glorified by Him. Nor when the Son, *existing in the form of God, took on Him the form of a servant*, was His Godhead diminished<sup>n</sup>; but rather He Himself became the Liberator of all flesh and all creation. And further, if *God sent forth His Son, born of a woman*, *that event brings us no shame, but rather glory and great grace.* For He became Man, that He might make us di-

<sup>1</sup> So Ep. Maxim. 2.

<sup>m</sup> A repetition of what he says in Orat. c. Arian. ii. 28.

<sup>n</sup> Comp. c. Apollin. i. 2. The *κένωσις* could not consist in any such actual diminution; for He who is God could as soon cease to be as to part with what is of His essence. It involved, says S. Hilary, no "abolitio naturae," de Trin. ix. 14. It consisted in a waiving of the full exercise of

Divine powers, the full enjoyment of Divine glory, the "status majestatis sue," Origen de Princ. ii. 6. 1. See Oosterzee's Image of Christ, pp. 143, 181 and comp. Bp. Ellicott on Phil. 2. 7. Cyril explains it as the self-humiliation which was involved in the Incarnation, but which yet could not affect His essential Deity, Quod unus sit Christus, (Pusey, p. 373.) Similarly Leo's Tome, c. 3.

<sup>AD</sup>  
<sup>ADELPHI.</sup> vine<sup>o</sup> in Himself: and He was made of a woman, and born of a Virgin, that He might carry over into Himself that original nature<sup>p</sup> of ours which had been perverted, and we thenceforward might become *a holy generation*, and *partakers of a Divine nature*, as the blessed Peter wrote<sup>q</sup>: and moreover, *what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, having sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.*

<sup>1 S. Pet. 2. 9.</sup>  
<sup>2 S. Pet. 1. 4.</sup>  
<sup>3. Rom. 8.</sup>

5. Therefore, as for those who disparage that flesh which was assumed by the Word, in order to liberate all men, and raise up men from the dead, and make redemption for sin, or those who, on account of it, accuse the Son of God of being a creature or a work<sup>r</sup>, how can they appear in any other light than as thankless and worthy of all detestation? For they do all but say aloud to God, “Do not send Thine Only-begotten Son in flesh; do not make Him to take flesh from a Virgin; (do not,) that He may not redeem us from death and sin. We wish Him *not* to be born in flesh, that He may *not* undergo death for us: we choose that the Word should *not* become flesh, in order that He may *not* therein become a mediating agent of our access to Thee, and that we may *not* dwell in the heavenly mansions. Let the gates of heaven be closed, that Thy Word may *not*, <sup>Heb. 10. 20.</sup> through *the veil of the flesh*, make for us a new way in the heavens.” These sayings of theirs are being uttered with diabolical audacity, through the perverse notion which they have imagined for themselves. For those who refuse to worship the Word made flesh are unthankful for their liberation: and those who divide the Word from the flesh, think that there has not taken place any redemption from sin, or any overthrow of death. But where will the impious men at all find that flesh, which the Saviour took, existing by itself, so that they may venture to say, “We do

<sup>o</sup> This bold phrase is used in De Synod. 51, and Orat. c. Arian. i. 42; ii. 70; iii. 37. “It was usual,” says Newman, “with Athanasius to call the Incarnation a θέωσις or θεοποίησις of the ἀνθρώπινον,” *Tracts Theol. and Eccles.*, p. 315. For a caveat against misuse of such language, see *Orat. c.*

Arian. iii. 19.

<sup>p</sup> Literally, “birth which had been led astray.”

<sup>q</sup> See this quoted in *Orat. c. Arian.* i. 16. Athanasius, we see, recognises 2 S. Peter as canonical.

<sup>r</sup> Arian watchwords. See *Ep. to Jovian.* 4.

not worship the Lord with the flesh, but we separate off the body, and worship Him alone<sup>s</sup>? ” Truly the blessed Stephen saw the Lord in heaven *standing on the right hand*: <sup>Acts 7.</sup> and the angels said to the disciples, *He will come in like* <sup>53.</sup> *manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven*: yes, and the Lord Himself said, addressing the Father, *I will that they* <sup>Ib. 1. 11.</sup> *be even with Me where I am.* <sup>S. John 17. 24.</sup> And altogether, if the flesh is inseparable from the Word, is it not necessary that those men should either lay aside their error, and henceforward worship the Father in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ<sup>t</sup>; or, as not worshipping nor serving that Word who came in flesh, should be cast out on all hands and no longer reckoned as Christians, but either as Heathens or as among the Jews?

6. To these men, then, as we said above, belongs such madness and audacity as this: but our faith is right, and derived from Apostolic teaching and the tradition of the fathers, and confirmed both from the New and the Old Testament<sup>u</sup>, for the Prophets say, *Send out Thy word and* <sup>Ps. 43. 3.</sup> *Thy truth*, and, *Behold, the Virgin shall conceive and bear* <sup>S. Matt. 1. 23.</sup> *a Son, and they shall call His Name Emmanuel, which is,* *being interpreted, God with us.* And what does this mean save that God was born in flesh? And the Apostolic tradition<sup>x</sup> teaches it, for blessed Peter says, *Since then Christ* <sup>1 S. Pet.</sup> *suffered for us in flesh*; and Paul writes, *Looking for the* <sup>4. 1. Titus 2.</sup> *blessed hope and appearance of the glory of our great God* <sup>13. 14.</sup> *and Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for us that He* *might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself* *a peculiar people, zealous of good works.* How then did He give Himself for us, unless He was clothed with flesh? For it was by offering flesh that He gave Himself for us, that, having undergone death in it, *He might destroy him* <sup>Heb. 2.</sup> *that had the power of death, the devil.* Therefore we al- <sup>14.</sup>

<sup>s</sup> I.e. the body of Christ is inseparable from His Divine Personality. Cp. c. Apollin. ii. 15. The passage in the text is translated in Dr. Pusey's Letter to Bp. Blomfield, p. 158. Compare on this inseparableness Pusey on Real Presence, p. 331.

<sup>t</sup> Which, in his mind, would imply the adoration of our Lord. Cp. Orat.

c. Ari. i. 42.

<sup>u</sup> Here Scripture is treated as confirmatory of Catholic tradition. So in Orat. c. Arian. iii. 28. Compare Keble, Aead. Sermons, p. 385 ff.

<sup>x</sup> Here “tradition” is used for an actual portion of Scripture. C. Apollin. i. 22. For a comment on the text see Orat. c. Arian. iii. 34.

AD  
ADELPHI. ways give thanks *in the name of Jesus Christ*: and we do not reject that grace which came to us through Him. For the Saviour's presence in flesh became the ransom from death, and the salvation of all creation. Therefore, O beloved and longed for, let those who love the Lord be put in remembrance of these things, and let those who have imitated the conduct of Judas, and forsaken the Lord that they might be companions of Caiaphas, receive by these condemnations a better teaching, if haply they are willing, if haply they can be made ashamed. And let them know that when we worship the Lord in flesh, it is not a creature that we worship, but the Creator as clothed with a created body, as we said above.

7. But we could wish your Piety to ask them this further question. When Israel was commanded to go up to Jerusalem to worship in the temple of the Lord, where

Heb. 9. 5. was the ark, *and above it the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat*, did they do well, or the contrary?

If they did amiss, why did those who neglected the law incur a penalty? For it is written, that whosoever should

Deut. 16. 16. set at nought the law, and not go up, *should be cut off from among the people*.

But if they did well, and in this matter became pleasing to God, do not those foul Arians, baser than all heretics, deserve many a death<sup>y</sup>, because, while approving the old law on account of the honour done to the temple, they do not choose to worship the Lord when existing in the flesh as in a temple<sup>z</sup>? And yet the ancient temple was constituted of stones and gold, as being a shadow; but when the reality came, the type thenceforward

S. Matt. 24. 2. ceased, and, as the Lord said, *there remained not one stone upon another that was not thrown down*.

And men did not, on the one hand, while beholding the temple made of stones, think that the Lord who spoke in that very temple was a creature; nor did they despise the temple, and go away to a distance to worship: but they entered into it,

<sup>y</sup> This vehement expression may be compared with that in Orat. ii. 28, "Let them be stoned by all men." So in Deer. Nic. 28. But S. Athanasius was on principle opposed to persecution, Apol. de Fuga 23; Hist. Ari. 33, 67.

<sup>z</sup> Cp. Orat. c. Ari. iii. 53. Nestorius in his sermons (ap. Marius Mercator) applied this imagery of "temple" and "garment" not simply to Christ's body, but to Christ Himself, whom he, in effect, regarded as a distinct person from the Son of God.

and worshipped, according to the law, the God who gave oracles from the temple. Since then this was so, can that Body of the Lord which is truly all-holy and worthy of all reverence, as to which the Archangel Gabriel brought good tidings, which was fashioned by the Holy Spirit, and made the clothing of the Word, be other than adorable<sup>a</sup>? It was surely a bodily hand, which the Lord stretched forth, when S. Matt. 8. 15. He raised up the woman suffering from fever; and it was a human voice which He uttered, when He raised Lazarus from the dead<sup>b</sup>, and again it was when He stretched forth hands upon the cross that He cast down *the prince of the Eph. 2. 2. power of the air, that which<sup>c</sup> now worketh in the children of disobedience*, and made the path through the heavens open for us.

8. Therefore he who dishonours the temple, dishonours the Lord who dwells in the temple: and he who divides the Word from the body, rejects the grace which was given to us in Him. And further, let not those most impious Ariomaniacs<sup>d</sup> think that because the body is created, the

<sup>a</sup> "All the Angels of heaven adore it," says Hooker, v. 54. 9. The Body of Christ is adorable as being ever in union with, not as if it could exist apart from, His Divine Personality, to which the adoration is directed, see c. Apollin. i. 6. Compare Pusey on Real Presence, p. 331. The illustration from the temple is obviously very imperfect; there being no such relation between the temple and the God of Israel as between Christ's body and Christ Himself. Epiphanius' illustration from the homage paid to the Emperor in his purple robe (Anecorat. 51), is still more unsatisfactory. On the inevitable imperfection of illustrations, see note in Athan. Treat. ii. 53. On the principle of "one adoration" (which Apollinaris had perverted, Mai, Nov. Collect. vii. 17), see Cyril's 8th Article. His "Eastern" critics admitted that it would be wrong to offer worship to the flesh and to the Word. Nestorius had said, "Let us venerate the man who by the Divine 'connection' is worshipped with God the Word;" and this, Cyril said, implied a duality of Persons, Apol. adv. Orient. 8. Theodoret, writing to Flavian of Constantinople, says that he

offers "one adoration" as to the Only-begotten, the one Christ, God and Man. Epist. 104. So the fifth General Council condemned those whose worship of Christ involved either the Nestorian or the Eutychian idea, and ordered that He should be "adored by one adoration as God the Word incarnate with (*μετὰ*) His own flesh," Mansi, ix. 381. When Apollinaris inferred from this principle that "the same could not be both adorable and not adorable, therefore could not be altogether God and Man" (Leontius), he seems to have meant, not at once a Divine and a human person. Therein he was right, for our Lord's Personality is both single and Divine. Or in other words, because it is single, therefore it is Divine. "For He Himself refers to its actings before His human nature was assumed: "Before Abraham was, I am." Wilberforce on the Incarnation, p. 132. Cf. Hooker, v. 53. 3.

<sup>b</sup> See the Tome, 7: and Orat. c. Arian. iii. 3. 32.

<sup>c</sup> *Toῦ πνεύματος* is omitted in this quotation.

<sup>d</sup> See the Tome 1. and c. Apollin. ii. 19.

AD  
ADELPHI.

Word also is a creature; nor let them, because the Word is not a creature, put a slur upon His body. For one may well wonder at their perverse notions, because they mix up and confound all things, and find out pretexts, merely in order that they may put the Creator into the number of the creatures. But let them listen to this<sup>e</sup>: if the Word had been a creature, He would not have assumed a created body, in order that He might give it life. For what help can come to the creatures from a creature, which itself is in need of salvation<sup>f</sup>? But since the Word, being Creator, Himself became the Maker<sup>g</sup> of the creatures, therefore also at the completion of the ages, He Himself clothed Himself with what was created, in order that He again, as Creator, might renew it, and be able to repair it. But no creature can ever be saved by a creature; even as the creatures could not, supposing the Word not to have been Creator, have been created by a creature. Wherefore let them not put a false sense on the Divine Scriptures, nor a stumbling-block in the way of the simpler brethren; but, if they are so minded, let them even reconsider their own opinions, and no longer worship the creature rather than the God who created all things<sup>h</sup>. But if they choose to adhere to their own impieties, let them be left alone in taking their fill of these things, and gnashing their teeth like their father the devil, because the faith of the Catholic Church knows the Word of God to be Creator and Maker of all things: and we know that in *the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God*, and Him too we worship as having become Man for our salvation, not as an equal made to exist in a body equal to ours, but as a Master

S. John  
1. 1.

Phil. 2. 7.

*who has taken on Him the form of a servant*, and as Maker and Creator who has become present in a creature, that, having made all things free in Himself, He might bring

<sup>e</sup> Quoted by Theodoret, Dial. ii. p. 137, as from the Epist. to Epictetus.

<sup>f</sup> So in Orat. c. Arian. ii. 67. "How could a thing made be joined to the Creator by a thing made, or what succour could have come from like to like, when the one as well as the other was in need of it?" As if to say, An

effective Redeemer must be Divine. Comp. Proclus, Homily, c. 5, with Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 478.

<sup>g</sup> Δημιουργός, see c. 3, 4.

<sup>h</sup> I.e. let them give up their Arianism, which, while calling the Son a created being, inconsistently worships Him. Cf. c. 3.

the world into His Father's presence, and give peace to all things, both things in heaven and things on earth. For thus we both recognize His Godhead as belonging to the Father<sup>i</sup>, and adore His presence in flesh, even though Ariomaniacs burst<sup>k</sup> with rage. Salute all who love our Lord Jesus Christ. We pray that you may be in health, and may remember us before the Lord, O beloved and truly longed for. If it be necessary, let this be read to Hierax the presbyter.

<sup>i</sup> Τὴν πατρικὴν αὐτοῦ θεότητα. So in Orat. c. Arian iii. 3, "the Godhead of the Father is the Being of the Son." Comp. ib. 6. "That which is proper

to the Father's essence is the Son."

<sup>k</sup> He uses the same phrase in Orat. c. Ari. ii. 23.

## S. ATHANASIUS' LETTER TO MAXIMUS, PHILOSOPHER.

### INTRODUCTION.

**MAXIMUS**, a Christian "philosopher," had written to Athanasius about various classes of "heresies," some of whom denied the Son's true Divinity, others substituted for the Incarnation a mere association between the Word and Jesus Christ, while others received the coarser form of Ebionism by rejecting the supernatural character of the Nativity. Athanasius, about 371, replied to him in this letter.

The Benedictine editors of Athanasius identify this Maximus with the "Cynic" of that name who afterwards practised on the simplicity of S. Gregory of Nazianzus, (Orat. 25) intrigued against him, was irregularly consecrated by Egyptian bishops for the see of Constantinople, and subsequently disowned in a canon of the Council of Constantinople, in 381, but recognised for a while by the Westerns, including S. Ambrose. But the editors of **Gregory Nazianzen** (monit. in Orat. 25.) contend with better reason that the Athanasian Maximus was a different person: for he is described by Athanasius in 371 as a man of piety and learning, whereas the Maximus who duped Gregory "had not put on the mask of piety" before his return from exile in 379.

### ATHANASIUS TO MAXIMUS.

TO MY SON BELOVED AND TRULY LONGED FOR, MAXIMUS, PHILOSOPHER, ATHANASIUS SENDS GREETING IN THE LORD.

1. WHEN I read what you had written, I appreciated your piety: but I wondered much at the rashness of those  
1 Tim. 1. who *understand neither what they say nor whereof they affirm*, and, in fact, determined to be silent; for to reply as to matters so plain, and more luminous than light, is nothing else but to furnish these transgressors with occasions for shamelessness. And this we have learned from the Saviour<sup>a</sup>. For when Pilate had washed his hands himself, and taken cognisance of the calumnious charges of the Jews of that time<sup>b</sup>, the Lord *gave him no further*

S. Mark  
15. 5.

S. Matt.  
27. 19.

<sup>a</sup> See Origen, Pref. to *c. Celsum*. S. Hilary says to an Arian, "How

<sup>b</sup> A hint that Arians are the Jews much more irreligious art thou than of "this time." See note in Athana- a Jew!" de Trin. vii. 23. \*  
sian Treatises, Lib. Fath. ii. 282.

answer, but instead, made an oracular communication to Pilate's wife, in order that He who was under trial might be believed to be God, not by word but by power. And while He gave no answer to the idle questioning of Caiaphas, He Himself by His promise brought over all men to knowledge (of Himself.) Accordingly, after delaying for a long time, and observing the logomachies<sup>c</sup> of those shameless men, I was with difficulty induced to yield to your zeal for the truth, and have dictated just as much as refers to what you wrote, and no more: in order that the adversary may at least be convinced by those same truths which he has gainsaid, and *refrain his tongue from evil, Ps. 34. and his lips that they speak no guile.* And God grant that such persons may no longer join those Jews *who passed by S. Matt. in reviling Him that hung on the tree,* (and saying,) *If Thou 27. 39, art Son of God, save Thyself.* But if even after this they 40. Gal. 3. 13. will not hide their heads, still do you, remembering the Apostle's exhortation, *avoid a heretical man after the first Tit. 3. and second admonition, knowing that such a one is perverted 10, 11. and sinneth, being self-condemned.* For if those who dare to say such things as these are Gentiles or Judaizers, let them, as Jews, deem the cross of Christ *a stumblingblock, 1 Cor. 1. and, as Greeks, a folly.* But if they represent themselves 23. to be Christians, let them learn that *the crucified Christ is Ib. 2. 8. Himself the Lord of glory<sup>d</sup>, and the Power of God and the Ib. 1. 24. Wisdom of God.*

2. But if they doubt whether He be God, let them pay

<sup>c</sup> Ep. Joy. 4; de Syn. 54.

<sup>d</sup> Compare c. Apoll. ii. 16. See Epiphan. Hær. 77, 32, that some Apollinarians misuse this text. On its true force see Pearson on Creed, i. 324. ff. S. Cyril employs it, Quod unus sit Christus, (Pusey, p. 406.) "It was not a mere man, honoured . . . by connection with Him, that was given for us: it is Himself, the Lord of glory, that was crucified," but "in flesh," so that "although He be said to suffer in flesh," τηρεῖται καὶ οὐτω τὸ ἄπαθες αὐτῷ καθὸ νοεῖται Θεός. (cf. also his Thesaurus, p. 272.) Theodoret discusses it towards the end of his third Dialogue. S. Ambrose interprets it to mean, "not that He was crucified in His majesty, but that

since the selfsame is God and Man . . . He who partook of both natures, the human and the divine, underwent the Passion in the nature of man: ut indiscretè et Dominus majestatis dicat esse qui passus est, et Filius hominis . . . qui descendit de caelo." De Fide ii. 7. 58. Similarly S. Leo quotes it in his Tome, c. 5. as an instance of the way in which "because of this unity of person which is to be recognised as in both natures, the Son of man, we read, descended from heaven, and the Son of God is said to have been crucified, while He suffered this, not in the Godhead itself . . . but in the weakness of human nature." So John Damascene, iii 3, 4.

AD  
MAX.  
S. John  
20. 28.  
Ib. 13.  
13.  
1 S. Pet.  
2. 24.

S. Matt.  
27. 54.

Heb. 9.  
26.

S. John  
8. 40.

regard to Thomas, who handled the Crucified<sup>e</sup>, and said that He was *Lord and God*. And let them stand in awe of the Lord Himself, who, after He had washed the disciples' feet, said, *Ye call me the Lord and the Teacher, and ye say well, for so I am*. But the body in which He existed when He washed their feet, was that in which *He bore our sins to the tree*. And He was attended as Master of the creation when the sun withheld its beams<sup>f</sup>, and the earth was trembling, and the rocks were being rent, and the executioners recognized the Crucified One as *truly the Son of God*. For the body which was seen was not that of some man, but of God, that in which He existed when at the time of the crucifixion He raised the dead. Unhallowed therefore is that boldness, with which they say that it was to some holy man that the Word came<sup>g</sup>: for that took place in each of the prophets and of the other saints: so that He must not (be thought to) show Himself in each case as born and again dying. It is not so: God forbid!

But *once in the consummation of the ages, for the abolition of sins*, did the Word Himself become flesh, and came forth from Mary the Virgin (as) man, like to ourselves, even as He said to the Jews, *Why seek ye to kill Me, a man who hath told you the truth?* It is not by partaking of some man's body, but by receiving the Body of the Word Himself<sup>h</sup>, that we are made divine.

3. And this is to me a matter of wonder, how they have even ventured to think that it was in the course of nature that He became Man<sup>i</sup>. For if this had been so, the men-

<sup>e</sup> Ep. Epict. 6. On S. Thomas' confession as accepted by Him whom he called his Lord and his God, see Orat. c. Ari. ii. 23, and Hilary de Trin. vii. 12.

<sup>f</sup> Ep. Adelph. 3.

<sup>g</sup> See the Tome, 7; Ep. Epict. 2. Cyril often argues similarly against the Nestorians.

<sup>h</sup> This is the thought repeatedly urged by Cyril of Alexandria, that the efficacy of the Holy Communion involves the personal Divinity of Christ. Thus in Ep. ad Nestor, 3. 7. (Pusey, p. 26.) "Receiving the flesh of Christ not as common flesh, . . . nor as that of a man who has been sanctified and associated with the Word by an union

of dignity, but as truly lifegiving and belonging to the Word Himself. For being by nature life, as God, when He became one with His own flesh, He rendered it lifegiving." So in his Explanation, art. 11, where he thus interprets S. John 6. 63. "For common flesh has no power to give life: and this the Saviour Himself attests, saying, 'The flesh profiteth nothing, the spirit is that which giveth life;' for since it has become the Word's own flesh, in this respect it is understood to be, and is, lifegiving."

<sup>i</sup> Eusebius says that some of the Ebionites denied the virginal birth of Jesus, iii. 27. Paul of Samosata expressly admitted it; "The Virgin bore

tion of Mary were superflous<sup>k</sup>. For nature knows nothing of a virgin becoming a mother without a man. Wherefore, by the good pleasure of the Father, being very God, and by nature the Word and Wisdom of the Father, He became corporeally Man, for the sake of our salvation, that, *having somewhat to offer for us*, He might save us all, who *through fear of death were all our lifetime subject to bondage*. For it was not any man that gave Himself for us: seeing that every man is liable to death, according to the words, *Earth thou art, and to the earth shalt thou go*, which were spoken to all in Adam. Nor was it any other of the things created: for every creature is liable to change<sup>l</sup>. But it was the Word Himself who offered His own Body for us, that our faith and *hope* might not have *a man* for their object, but that we might fix our faith on God the Word Himself. Assuredly, even when He became Man, we *beheld His glory, a glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth*. For that, as God, He gave dignity to the sufferings which He endured through the body, and while He hungered in flesh, in His Divine character He fed those who were hungering. And if any one is scandalized at His bodily acts<sup>m</sup>, let him rely on His Divine operations. For He asks humanly, where Lazarus is lying: but Divinely, He raises him up<sup>n</sup>. Wherefore, let no one laugh while calling Him a child, and mentioning His “age” and “growth” and His eating, and drink-

Him through the Holy Spirit,” Routh's Reli. Sacr. iii. 300.

<sup>k</sup> Περιττὴ τῆς Μαρίας ἡ μνήμη, an expression used for a different purpose in Ep. Epict. 4.

<sup>l</sup> Ὄποιπός ἐστι τροπῆς. Comp. the Nicene anathema denying the Son to be *τρεπτός*, Ep. ad Joy. 3. Change was impossible for God, therefore for His Son, see ad Afros. 7; Orat. c. Ari. i. 35. But according to the old Arians, the Son's nature was intrinsically capable of moral change: and an actual change of another kind was supposed by the Arian notion that this nature became as a “soul” to the Christ, which, says Hilary, would imply that the Word “de se defecerit,” de Trin. x. 50. Hence also the indignation excited by the Apollinarian

notion of a change of a part of the Divine nature into flesh: cf. Ep. Epict. 2. Again “Theodoret entitles his first Dialogue (against Eutychians) *Ἄτρεπτος*,” see Athan. Treat. ii. 289.

<sup>m</sup> See Orat. c. Ari. ii. 32; Cyril, adv. Theod. 10, says that those who think his humiliations lowering should the rather admire His great love; and adv. Orient. 11, “I do not think that any one of sound mind will find fault with Him because He stooped to our sphere for our sakes.” Heresy has often begun in mistaken reverence, Athan. Treat. i. 221; Pusey's Sermons on Faith, p. 61. Cf. Liddon's Univ. Serm. i. 200.

<sup>n</sup> Comp. the Tome, 7, and S. Leo's Tome, 4.

Heb. 8. <sup>3.</sup> Ib. 2. 15.

Gen. 3. <sup>19.</sup>

AD.  
MAX.

ing, and suffering :” lest, by denying the properties of the body, he should also deny entirely His coming on our behalf<sup>o</sup>. And as it was not in the course of nature that He became man, so it was consistent that, having assumed a body, He should exhibit its properties, lest the Docetism<sup>p</sup> of Manes should prevail. But again it was consistent that while He was acting in a body, He should not conceal the attributes of the Godhead, lest the Samosatene should find a pretext, calling Him “a man,” as if He were another than the Word<sup>q</sup>.

S. Matt.  
27. 52.

4. Let the unbeliever then understand this, and learn that He was an infant in the manger, but subjected the Magi to Himself, when He was worshipped by them<sup>r</sup>: and He went down as a child into Egypt, but overthrew<sup>s</sup> the idolatrous images: and after being crucified in flesh, He raised up dead men who had long before mouldered into decay. And it was made clear to all that He did not bear this for His own sake, but for ours, that we, being endued through His sufferings with insensibility to suffering<sup>t</sup>, and with immortality, might abide unto eternal life.

5. I have dictated this in a concise form, borrowing it, as I said before, from what is your own, not working it out to further lengths, but only mentioning the subject of the Divine Cross, in order that the very circumstances at which the heedless stumbled might lead them, on better instruction, to adore the Crucified. But do you apply persuasion, in a genuine way, to the unbelievers; perhaps they may somehow come from ignorance to clear knowledge, and believe aright. And although what you wrote was sufficient, still it is well also to add the above, in reply to the contentious, by way of reminder: in order that

<sup>o</sup> This is an anticipation of the general anti-Entylian argument, set forth in the Tome or 28th Epistle of Leo, c. 5.

<sup>p</sup> Φαντασία. Compare on Manichean Docetism, Ep. Epict. 7, Adelph. 2. Athanasius means, The supernatural character of His birth made it all the more necessary to exclude Docetism by exhibiting the actual conditions of bodily life.

<sup>q</sup> Ἀλλον ὄντα. See Tom. ad Ant.

3, on Paul of Samosata’s opinions.

<sup>r</sup> Cp. Leo’s Tome, c. 4. “He is Lord of all, whom the Magi rejoice to adore on bended knee.”

<sup>s</sup> Κατήργησε. This seems to allude to the story in the Apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy, c. 23, where Isa. 19. 1 is quoted.

<sup>t</sup> Alluding to the eagerness with which Martyrs welcomed death for His sake, &c. see De Incarn. Verbi 29.

they may not, as if convicted, be made ashamed of their audacity, but, as if reminded, may not forget the truth <sup>u</sup>. For let the confession of faith, made by the fathers at Nicaea, stand good: for it is correct, and capable of overthrowing any impious heresy, and especially the Arian, which insults the Word of God, and necessarily falls into impiety against His Holy Spirit <sup>x</sup>.

Greet all those who believe rightly. All who are with us greet you.

<sup>u</sup> An instance of his tender considerateness. His object is not to gain an argumentative victory, which might not win over the opponents, but to appeal to such true ideas as they still held, and thus to lead them on to the full truth. So in *De Synod.* 41.

<sup>x</sup> That is, to dishonour the Son involves dishonour to the Holy Spirit. In *Ep. ad Serap.* 1. 2, he argues conversely, that to dishonour the Holy

Spirit is to dishonour the Son. "If men . . . consider the Son (as is the case) to be the Maker of things made, why do they call the Holy Spirit a creature, seeing that He has the same oneness with the Son, which the Son has with the Father? If they had thought rightly of the Word, they would also have thought soundly of the Spirit."

## THE TWO BOOKS AGAINST APOLLINARIS.

### INTRODUCTION.

**APOLLINARIANISM** is perhaps in one respect less interesting to a modern theological student than the counter-movement of Nestorianism; partly because its propositions seem strange even to repulsiveness, partly because in our day such Christian thought as is not guided by the Catholic definitions sets in a direction opposite to that of minimising the human element in the Incarnation of our Lord. And yet Apollinarianism is one of the most melancholy phenomena of Church history<sup>a</sup>, as a heretical reaction against heresy, conducted by a bishop<sup>b</sup> of rare ability, respected and even loved by typical Churchmen for his services to historic Christianity<sup>c</sup>, and animated, even in the speculations which misled him, by a religious zeal for the majesty of Christ<sup>d</sup>; a reaction also which not only did fatal mischief by destroying faith in the Redeemer's real Humanity, but also provoked an equally calamitous revulsion in the direction of a denial of His Personal Oneness. It must never be forgotten that Apollinaris was the rock of offence to Theodore and to Nestorius; that S. Cyril, throughout his struggle with the latter heresiarch, was continually dogged by the suspicion of Apollinarianism; and lastly, that one part of the Apollinarian theory was revived with a modification by the Monophysites.

The namesake and abler son of an able father, Apollinaris had made his mark by literary achievements of the most varied kind. He had a singular facility<sup>e</sup> of composition: he was, so to speak, “in omnia paratus;” no work came amiss to him. He was a keen logician<sup>f</sup>: in his earlier years he had taught rhetoric<sup>g</sup>: he afterwards wrote commentaries on several books of Scripture, taking a line of his own as to their sequence<sup>h</sup>, and as to the rendering of the Hebrew<sup>i</sup>: he replied, in thirty books, to Porphyry's treatise “against

<sup>a</sup> See Church of the Fathers, p. 156, ed. 4, and Tillemont vii. 627.

<sup>b</sup> “Bishop of Laodicea in Syria,” says Jerome de Vir. Illust. 112. Tillemont would date his consecration in 361, shortly before the Council of Alexandria. A decided anti-Arian could hardly have obtained a Syrian bishopric of importance while Constantius lived; but he might have been elected at the end of 361.

<sup>c</sup> Athanasius formed an intimacy with him as early as 346, on his own return home after his second exile, Soz. vi. 29. Epiphanius says he was “dear to us, to Pope Athanasius, and to all orthodox men,” Hær. 77. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Epiphanius, Hær. 77. 25. “If you have thought, as it were, to assist our Lord by saying He did not assume a mind,” &c. Cp. c. Apoll. ii. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Basil, Ep. 129, “who finds it easy to say anything,” and Ep. 244, “I am told that he is the most copious writer that ever lived.”

<sup>f</sup> Epiph. Hær. 77. 24.

<sup>g</sup> Soc. ii. 46.

<sup>h</sup> Jerome, c. Rufin. ii. 34. Jerome heard him lecture on Scripture at Antioch, in 373, Epist. 84. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Jerome, Comm. in Eccles. 12. He thought that Apollinaris's comments on Isaiah were more like “indices capitulorum.” Prod. in Isa.

Christians<sup>k</sup> ;” and when Julian forbade Christians to lecture on Greek authors, Apollinaris, in conjunction with his father<sup>l</sup>, adventurously set to work to supply Christian books written in classical style. Both father and son had come into collision with two Arianizing bishops<sup>m</sup> ; and the son had accepted exile rather than communicate with the Arians<sup>n</sup>. He hated Arianism with all his heart : he wrote, says Theophilus<sup>o</sup>, against Arians and Eunomians : and it would seem that his versatile and daring mind was attracted by the notion of wresting a weapon from Arian hands, and using it against their own heresy. For several, at least, among the Arians maintained that the “Godhead” which they recognised in Christ was to Him in place of a human soul<sup>p</sup>. It was natural for them to think so ; for this “Godhead” was simply titular and unreal, and might well discharge the functions and act under the conditions of the immaterial part in man. Apollinaris, it appears, resolved to utilise this idea with a modification, for the purpose of constructing a Christology on the basis of the Nicene Creed. The modification was this : he would allow the  $\psi\chi\acute{\eta}$ , or mere animal soul<sup>q</sup>, to exist in the Incarnate ; he regarded it as part of the outer man. But the  $\nu\acute{o}\nu\acute{s}$ , the rational soul, the mind, *that* could not be recognised in the Divine Christ without a breach in the unity of the Person, because it carried with it a complete human personality<sup>r</sup> : nor without a derogation from His essential holiness, because it involved the possibility of sin<sup>s</sup>. Therefore, argued Apollinaris, its place must be supplied by the Divine Word, who is, in the highest of all senses, Spirit and Mind. He was probably not responsible, except indirectly, for the abandonment of this distinction by some of his followers, who adopted the Arian

<sup>k</sup> Jerome, Ep. 70. 3 ; 84. 3.

<sup>l</sup> Soe. ii. 45, who says he embodied the Gospel history, etc. in a Platonic dialogue. A version of the Psalter into hexameters is extant, and is ascribed to him : Galland. Bibl. Patr. v. 359. ff. Sozomen ignores the elder Apollinaris’s part in this undertaking, and ascribes to the younger sacred tragedies, comedies, odes, and a heroic poem on Old Testament history, with a “ Defence of Truth ” against Pagan philosophers, v. 18.

<sup>m</sup> Soz. l. c.

<sup>n</sup> Epiphanius, Haer. 77. 24.

<sup>o</sup> Pasch. Ep. 2=Jerome, Ep. 98.

<sup>p</sup> See introd. to Ep. to Adelphi. Cf. Leontius de Seetis, act. 3. c. 4. (Galland, xii, 635.) and see below, c. Apoll. i. 15. cf. Card. Newman, Tracts Theol. and Eccl. p. 258.

<sup>q</sup> See Theodoret, Haer. Fab. iv. 8. “ He said that God the Word became incarnate by assuming a body and a soul—not the rational soul, but the irrational, which some call physical or vital : but maintaining the mind to be something different from the soul, he said that it had not been assumed, but that the Divine nature was sufficient to supply the want of a mind.”

<sup>r</sup> See c. Apoll. i. 2. Leontius (Galland. Bibl. Patr. xii. 707) quotes him as saying that if there were “ two perfects,” i.e. the Divine Nature of the Word and a human mind with soul and flesh, there would be two hypostases or persons. From Gregory Nyssen’s *Antirrheticos*, 6, 35, 38, 50, 53, it is clear that he was bent on securing the unity of our Lord’s Person. He fancied (see his words, ib. 42) that his opponents held a mere “ connection ” or  $\sigma\iota\pi\alpha\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\alpha$ , as the Nestorians did afterwards.

<sup>s</sup> See c. Apoll. i. 2. So Apollinaris ap. Mai, Nov. Collect. vii. 70, that the human mind, being essentially  $\tau\pi\epsilon\pi\tau\acute{\rho}\acute{s}$ , capable of turning from good to evil, could not coexist with a Divine mind ; they would be at variance with each other. See too Greg. Nyss. *Antirrh.* 38, quoting Apollinaris that the work of the Incarnation could not have been accomplished,—the salvation of men could not have been effected,—if there had been in Christ a human mind, with its self-determining power and its inherent moral mutability ; the object was attained because there was in Him only flesh wrought upon by a Divine Mind.

denial of any human soul, even of a  $\psi\chi\acute{\eta}$ , in the Person of Christ<sup>1</sup>, but, of course, with the very anti-Arian aim of making Him as simply Divine as possible: and this notion, mistakenly attributed by Augustine's friend Alypius to the Church, hindered his advance "towards the Christian Faith, until he ascertained that it was the error of the Apollinarian heretics."<sup>2</sup>

Such was, on the whole, Apollinaris's peculiar doctrine as to the non-existence in Christ of a "reasonable" human "soul."<sup>3</sup> The other Apollinarian proposition was a development, which belongs rather to the disciples than to the master<sup>4</sup>: but both of them were evidently twin errors of present significance to the unknown compiler of the "Athanasian Creed." Nothing is said in the "Tome" of the Alexandrian Council of any strange doctrine as to the Body of Christ: but Apollinarian thought, having received its impulse, went on to speculate on that aspect of the Incarnation. Apollinaris himself taught,—not openly, but in a secret circle of hearers,—that the body assumed by the Word Incarnate was, as such, "coessential" with the Godhead<sup>5</sup>, to which, in a real sense, the sufferings and death must be ascribed. Others proceeded to say what, if we can trust his positive disclaimers, he abstained from saying<sup>6</sup>, that it was not really a human body, but of heavenly origin, being in fact nothing less than a portion of Godhead "converted into flesh;" whence it followed, either that the Godhead was thus far capable of suffering, or that the bodily condition and sufferings of Christ were "Docetic" and unreal.

In this way a second wound was inflicted on the doctrine which presented to the belief and adoration of the Church a Redeemer who, being very God,

<sup>1</sup> Some say that Apollinaris at first denied any "soul," and then admitted a  $\psi\chi\acute{\eta}$  but denied a  $\nu\breve{\nu}\breve{\sigma}\breve{\nu}$ . See Pearson on the Creed, ii. 329; Tillmont, vii. 602 ff. He sometimes spoke as if he thought the Word did not take a  $\psi\chi\acute{\eta}$ , Mai, vii. 203. But again he granted a  $\sigma\grave{\alpha}\rho\acute{\varepsilon}\acute{\kappa}\mu\psi\chi\acute{\eta}\sigma$ , Greg. Nyss. Antirrh. 7, 29; and Gregory rejoins that if the  $\psi\chi\acute{\eta}$  is  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\circ\gamma\circ\sigma$ , the Apollinarians must say that there is in Christ a mere animal ( $\kappa\acute{\eta}\nu\circ\sigma$ ) and not man. So S. Augustine, in Joan. Tract. 23. 6; that they allowed Him an "anima belluina," and denied to Him a "mens rationalis."

<sup>2</sup> S. Aug. Confess. vii. c. 19.

<sup>3</sup> See Pearson on Creed, i. 399. "The error of Apollinaris was, that Christ had no proper intellectual or rational soul, but that the Word was to Him in the place of a soul."

<sup>4</sup> Epiphanius says that Apollinaris will not deny the (human) "reality of the flesh of Christ," Hær. 77, 25.

<sup>5</sup> See Galland, xii. 704. He seems to have denied that he had ever called it *abstractedly* coessential or Divine. Being united to God, he thought, it should be called "Divine" and even

"God," just as the "Word" could be called "flesh," Galland, xii. 706.

<sup>6</sup> See the extract in Leontius, ap. Galland, xii. 701. "We have always written that neither is the Saviour's flesh from heaven," &c. "It is granted as certain that the body is from the Virgin, the Godhead from heaven." Theodoret cites passages from him denying any "change of Godhead," and acknowledging the assumption of flesh from Mary, Dial. i. fin. and others, admitting that the body of Christ was a real body. But he did hold "fleshly" (human) "nature to have been from the beginning in the Son," Greg. Naz. Ep. 202, so Greg. Nyss. Antirrh. 13, 18; meaning, according to Dorner, not that His material body had been coessential, but that the Divine Son had been from eternity an archetype of Manhood. It has been suspected that Apollinaris in his disclaimers was either inconsistent (see Theodoret v. 3.) or insincere, (Leontius:) and if he never did assert any "change" of the Godhead, some such ideas were current in the Antiochene district when Paulinus disclaimed them in 363, see the Tome, 11.

had vouchsafed to become very Man, to enter in His unchanged personality into a human sphere of existence, to be “made in all points like unto his brethren, sin apart,” a sympathizing High Priest, an Exemplar of human sanctity. Certain texts<sup>b</sup> were adduced by the Apollinarian school in support of their theory; but it was really based on abstract considerations, or on alleged logical necessities<sup>c</sup>, and thus laid itself open to the charge of calling in rationalism to uphold will-worship<sup>d</sup>. Nor can the Apollinarians be acquitted of an equivocal use of terms, which often imposed on the simpler-minded Churchmen<sup>e</sup>. Their energy in disseminating their opinions by a copious array of treatises<sup>f</sup>, by poetry for popular use<sup>g</sup>, by the intrusion of their bishops into Catholic dioceses<sup>h</sup>, was not checked by repeated synodal condemnations<sup>i</sup>, and by unwilling censures from theologians who could claim to represent existing orthodoxy, and who had with difficulty been persuaded that Apollinaris had fallen out of its path<sup>k</sup>.

We are not here concerned with his alleged inclination to Sabellianism<sup>l</sup>, his “carnal” and “Judaic” Chiliasm<sup>m</sup>, the scandals caused by his controversial pertinacity, and the division of his followers into the more mode-

<sup>b</sup> E. g. S. John 3. 13; 1 Cor. 2. 8; 15. 47; Phil. 2. 7. They put a fantastic interpretation on 1 Cor. 2. 16.

<sup>c</sup> Tillemont says, vii. 603, that they based their dogma on “pensées de l'esprit humain.” See Mozley on Theory of Development, p. 42; “Each sect appealed triumphantly to the logical irresistibleness of its development . . . All had one watchword; and that was, Be logical . . . Be logical, said the Apollinarian: Jesus Christ was not two persons: he was not therefore perfect God and perfect man too.”

<sup>d</sup> Basil calls it a *κανοφωνία*, a theory unsupported by tradition, Ep. 244. 3. Epiphanus speaks of Apollinaris's contentious objections, Hær. 77, 18: cf. e. Apollin. ii. 18.

<sup>e</sup> See above on the Tome, c. 7, and Greg. Naz. Ep. 102. In 375, Vitalis, of whom Tillemont says that he was “never anything but an impostor,” deceived Pope Damasus by an apparently orthodox statement, Greg. Ep. 101: see Tillemont, vii. 618; viii. 406, and Timothy had been even recommended by Athanasius, as orthodox, to Damasus, Facundus de Trib. Capit. vii. 3.

<sup>f</sup> See Basil, quoted above; and Ep. 263 (written in 377.) “He has filled the world with his writings.” So we find extracts from his books against Diodore of Tarsus, a book to Flavinius, On Tradition of Renunciation and Belief (for Catechumens), a Compendium, a little book on Faith, On the Union, a tract on the Incarnation, and a longer work on “the Divine

Incarnation in the likeness of man,” reviewed in Gregory Nyssen's Antirheticon.

<sup>g</sup> Cf. Greg. Naz. Ep. 101, on the “new psalters” of the Apollinarians, and Soz. vi. 29 on the charm of his hymns, and on his verses composed for men at convivial parties or at their work, and for women at their looms. He was here taking a leaf out of Arius's book, Philost. ii. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Basil, Ep. 365.

<sup>i</sup> By two Roman synods under Damasus, and the Second General Council.

<sup>k</sup> See Epiph. Hær. 77. 14, pleading with “our brethren.” “Let us not lose each other:” ib. 18, disclaiming all animosity, and wishing that Apollinaris might not be “separated from the Church and from the affection of the brethren.” This was written before the open breach. Basil also, in 377, wrote to the Egyptian exiles, Ep. 265, quoting Psal. 55. 12, and urging them to try to reclaim Apollinaris.

<sup>l</sup> Theodoret, Hær. Fab. iv. 8. See a passage quoted by Basil, Ep. 129, as said to be by Apollinaris. His language about a scale or triple gradation of Godhead, Greg. Ep. 101, (cf. Theod. H. E. v. 3.) might be interpreted in a Sabellianizing sense, but Dorner takes it to mean that the Son and the Spirit had affinities to humanity which the Father had not.

<sup>m</sup> See Epiph. Hær. 77, 26: Basil Ep. 263: Greg. Naz. Ep. 102. 2: Jerome, de Vir. Illustr. 18.

rate and the more extreme<sup>u</sup>. As to the dates of the controversy, a passage of Gregory of Nazianzus would place the first rise of Apollinarianism ten years before the Alexandrian Council of 362<sup>v</sup>, to which, as we have seen, Apollinaris thought it advisable to send delegates. But this date is somewhat too early, for Basil intimates that Apollinaris was still unsuspected about 355<sup>w</sup>. But the negation of a human soul in Christ came before that council: the further notion as to His body was rife at Corinth some nine years later: and about 372, it is thought, Athanasius wrote these two books against the entire theory. In 373, and again in 375, Basil had reason to disclaim all fellowship with Apollinaris<sup>x</sup>: at the end of 376, Apollinaris openly formed a sect by consecrating Vitalis bishop for the party at Antioch<sup>y</sup>, and in 377 he and his chief followers were formally "deposed" by a Council at Rome. The sect gave great trouble to Gregory, both during and after his sojourn at Constantinople<sup>z</sup>: and he was instrumental in procuring<sup>t</sup> from Theodosius in 385 a general law against its freedom of worship.

The books called "Contra Apollinarium" were directed against a number of Apollinarian opinions as held by a school or party: and the venerable writer, who seems in some passages to have left his first draft uncorrected, refrains from censuring his former friend by name. Referring to doubts which had been entertained as to the genuineness of the work, the Benedictines say that its affinity to the letters to Epictetus, Adelphius, and Maximus, is so manifest as to be decisive.

<sup>u</sup> Valentinus being the representative of the moderate, Polemon and Timothy of the latter, see Leontius adv. fraud. Apoll. and Photius, Cod. 230. Polemon even spoke scornfully of Athanasius as "opinionated."

<sup>v</sup> Greg. Ep. 102: he wrote it in 382, and says it was 30 years since Apollinarianism had begun.

<sup>w</sup> Basil, Ep. 226, 4, written in 375.

<sup>x</sup> Basil, Ep. 131 and 224.

<sup>y</sup> According to Tillemont, vii. 620, this was after a test was proposed to Vitalis in the form of a profes-

sion of faith given by Theodore, v. 11: it affirmed that "The Word of God did not Himself exist in His own body instead of the rational and intelligent soul, but assumed and saved our soul, that is, a soul rational and intelligent without sin." Vitalis could not evade this, and therefore refused it.

<sup>z</sup> An Apollinarian bishop was set up at Nazianzus; hence Gregory wrote his two important letters to Cledonius, Epp. 101 and 102.

<sup>t</sup> Through Nectarius, his successor at Constantinople, Ep. 202.

# ON THE INCARNATION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, AGAINST APOLLINARIS.

## BOOK I.

1. It is the persistent habit of a pious man, dear friend, to venerate the All<sup>a</sup> in silence, and with loud thanksgivings to praise God his Benefactor, according to that saying of Scripture which runs, *He will sit alone*, and be silent <sup>Lam. 3.</sup> *and quiet, and do his own business.* The words “alone” and “his own business” mean that he will order his own conduct with judgment, and attend seriously to the commandment of God. But since you have become aware of a very heavy weariness among those who seem to say the same things, you have asked me about the faith that is in us, and wherein lies the fault of those who think themselves orthodox, yet who in their great extravagance fear not to utter unhallowed opinions, whereby persons unstable in the faith are carried away, and know not that they are off the right path (for had they been established in the faith, they would not have yielded to language of that kind: but it is because their minds were unemployed that they have become capable of accepting such traditions, from which arise extravagant conceit and vast wickedness: and they, being blinded by antipathy, pervert the revelations of the Prophets, and the teachings of the Apostles, and the injunctions of the fathers, and the very and manifest sayings of the Master:) it is necessary to undertake to confute them<sup>b</sup>, in order that they may either wake up and see how the case stands, or may be disabled from deceiving any persons by promising them a very distinct comprehension of Christ<sup>c</sup>, *understanding neither what* <sup>1 Tim. 1.</sup> *they say nor whereof they affirm.* <sup>7.</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Τὸν πᾶν seems here to mean the whole order of the universe as administered by the Divine Word, who “contains and combines in Himself all things visible and invisible.” Athan. c. Gentes, 42.

<sup>b</sup> Lit. “whom to confute.” The construction of the whole sentence is incomplete.

<sup>c</sup> See Cyril Alex. de recta fide ad Theodos. 16. (Pusey, p. 48.) The Apollinarians, he says, disregarding

C. APOLL. 2. For the fathers have said that the Son is “coessential with the Father, and very God from very God,” and Perfect from Perfect<sup>d</sup>: and then that He “came down for our salvation, was incarnate and made Man,” and then that He thus suffered and rose again. But lest any one, on hearing of suffering and resurrection, should think that God the Word was altered, they definitely assert the unchangeableness and unalterableness of the Son<sup>e</sup>, with a condemnation (of the opposite opinion.) But these men either imagine an alteration of the Word, or suppose the economy<sup>f</sup> of the Passion to be unreal<sup>g</sup>, calling the Flesh of Christ sometimes uncreate and heavenly, sometimes coessential with the Godhead<sup>h</sup>. Then, they say, “in place “of the inward man which is in us, there is in Christ a “heavenly mind<sup>i</sup>, for He used the outward form<sup>k</sup> with “which He was invested as instrumental<sup>l</sup>: for it was not

the traditions of the ancient faith, and preferring to follow “human reasonings” and “excessive refinement,” argue that if Christ had a complete Humanity, then this Humanity could not be so united to Godhead as to form but one Christ, because the constituents of what is one perfect thing must be themselves imperfect. S. Basil says, that Apollinaris’s theology is based not on Scriptural proofs but on human premises, Ep. 263; again, that Apollinaris “threw the doctrine of the Incarnation into confusion, and rendered the economy of salvation ambiguous to the many by his muddy and dark questions,” Epist. 265. Greg. Naz. says that they profess to go by geometrical demonstrations, Ep. 101. See below, c. Apoll. i. 13.

<sup>d</sup> Here he paraphrases the Creed.

<sup>e</sup> See Ep. ad Adelph. 4. The “assertion” is in the original Nicene anathemas.

<sup>f</sup> See Tom. ad Antioch. 7.

<sup>g</sup> Δόκουσι, cf. 3, 16; ii. 1, 12. Ep. ad Epict. 7. ad Adelph. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Apollinaris seemed to do this, Leont. adv. fraud. Ap. Galland. xii. 701. Yet Leontius quotes him as asserting it, ib. xii. 704, 705; and what he disowned was really what no one would hold, that flesh was coessential with God, apart from Incarnation.

<sup>i</sup> That is, the Godhead. But “what

is that to me?” asks Gregory; “Godhead with flesh and soul, but without mind, is not man,” Ep. 101. He means, of course, Christ could not be both God and Man, if He had not a human mind.

<sup>k</sup> Ξχήματι, outward or bodily form, cf. Phil. 2. 8.

<sup>l</sup> There is of course a true sense in which Christ’s Manhood is the “instrument” of His Godhead, for the sanctification and salvation of man. So Athanasius, Orat. c. Ari. iii. 31, 35, speaks of His Body as His instrument; and see Aquinas, Sum. Theol. 3. 48. 6; Newman’s Sermons, iii. 161; and Liddon’s Bamp. Lect. p. 259: but the Apollinarists seem to have regarded the Flesh of Christ as an instrument merely for manifesting His divinity. See Greg. Naz. Ep. 102, and Newman, note in Athan. Treatises, ii. 443, and Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 267. Comp. Cyril Alex. ad Theodos. c. 12. (Pusey, p. 56) that if the purpose of the Incarnation were reduced to a mere manifestation of the Word, “it were better for us to adopt Docetism;” but its purpose was far broader, the redemption of man in body and soul, which required an assumption of both body and soul by the Son of God, as the “root and first-fruits of those who are formed anew to newness of life,” &c.

“possible that He should become perfect Man. For where “there is perfect man, there is also sin: and two perfect “things cannot become one<sup>m</sup>: for otherwise that conflict “of sin which is in us would take place also in Christ”, “and Christ would need the cleansing which we receive, if “on becoming man He assumed the thinking element and “that which in us directs<sup>o</sup> the flesh.” But, they say, “He “assumed that which is without mind, that He Himself “might be mind<sup>p</sup> in Himself, and might be wholly without “experience of sin, in regard to the Divine element, and “to the mindless flesh. For the flesh would not sin unless “that which directs the flesh, that is, the thinking element, “had previously conceived the idea of committing the sin,

<sup>m</sup> Compare c. Apollin. ii. 6. Apollinaris himself, quoted by Leontius, Galland, xii. 706, 7, said that Christ was perfect in Divine perfection, not in human; and that there were not two natures perfect in themselves, because there were not two Sons. It must be remembered that here, as in the Quicunque, “perfect man” means man in completeness of nature. See Newman's Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 264; “He (Apollinaris) argued, as if from the nature of the case, that nothing could be taken up by the Divine Word into His personality, which was already individual and one . . . Δύο τέλεια could not in any real sense coalesce and unite, for this would be like saying that one and one do not make two.” He could not conceive that a human mind or spirit could exist apart from a separate human personality. Athanasius, in effect, asserts that it can; for he disclaims the idea of two “perfections” or complete beings separate from each other, below, c. 16, and constantly identifies the Son of Mary with the Son of God. Gregory Nyssen observes that Godhead and Manhood are not related to each other as perfect and imperfect, Antirrhet. 50. Gregory Nazianzen says, Epist. 101, that the objection, “The Incarnate Christ could not include δύο τέλεια,” is taken from natural comparisons, irrelevant as to spiritual natures. How, he asks, can a human or angelic mind be called “perfect” in such a sense as to be excluded by comparison with Godhead? Compare a sunbeam to the sun, a drop of water to a river: *they*

are not excluded by the presence of the sun or the river (i.e. it does not follow that because the sun shines into a house, the sunbeams must depart from it.) The human mind is perfect in one sense, as superior to ψυχή and body: but it is not perfect in comparison with Godhead. In Ep. 102 he says that “perfect man” is understood by Apollinaris to mean, not Him who was “tried in all points as man yet without sin,” but the combination of God with flesh. In this equivocal sense, the phrase was admitted. We must own that in Christ humanity is not a complete thing in the sense in which it is complete in each of us, inasmuch as it is not personal; it is taken into union with a Personality, an Ego, which is Divine; and as it belongs to the mystery of the Trinity that the Divine Persons are not individuals, so it belongs to the mystery of the Incarnation that real manhood exists without a human personality. Compare Newman's Sermons, iii. 165, vi. 65: Liddon's Bamp. Lect. p. 259 ff. and see below on c. 10.

<sup>n</sup> So Apollinaris, Galland, xii. 706, objected to the phrase, “God assumed the whole of man,” on the ground that the whole of man was not pure from all sin in this life.

<sup>o</sup> Τὸ δγον τὴν σάρκα, see c. 20. So in c. Gentes, 33, the soul κινεῖ τὸ σῶμα. See Theod. v. 3, “the natural soul, which is entrusted with the office θεύνειν τὸ σῶμα.” Apollinaris held that in Christ, the “hegemonical” element must be the Word.

<sup>p</sup> See Epiphanius, Haer. 77. 23.

C. APOLL. "and had carried it out, through the body, to the completion of sin<sup>1</sup>. Wherefore Christ exhibited the flesh in a 'new condition', by way of likeness: and each man exhibits in himself the condition of the thinking element 'in us, by means of imitation, and likeness, and abstinence from sin'. And in this way is Christ understood to be 'without sin'."

3. These are their sophisms, and perverse notions: and they use more than one argument; for many are the perversities of unbelief, invented by human reasonings. Let us then ask these men to consider the will of God's good pleasure, (for it is said, *The Lord sware, and will not repent*,) and the completion of that economy which is most true, and the grace of that benefit which is most complete, questioning them in turn as to their notions, whether they all agree with the prophetic revelations, whether they follow the apostolic teachings, whether they walk in the line of the injunctions of the fathers, whether they do not set aside the manifest declarations of the Master; so that from the prophetic revelations, and the apostolic teachings, and the things fulfilled by the Lord, may be educed the acknowledgment of the truth and the confutation of error. Tell us, then, you inventors of that new Gospel of yours, Gal. 1. 7. *which is not another*, from what source it was announced to you that you should speak of a flesh uncreated, so as either to imagine the Godhead of the Word to have been converted into flesh<sup>2</sup>, or to consider the economy of the Passion, and of the Death, and of the Resurrection to be unreal<sup>3</sup>. For the Holy Trinity of the Godhead is alone manifestly uncreate, and eternal, and unchangeable, and

<sup>1</sup> Apollinaris meant, "In order to secure Christ's impeccability, we must exclude from Him the human mind, which is as such morally mutable (*τρεπτός*) in virtue of its freedom of choice. It was a cardinal point in the Arian heresy to make the Word thus mutable: and we must deny it again in regard to Him as Christ," see on c. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Literally, "newness."

<sup>3</sup> That is, the relation between Christ's flesh and our flesh, and between the mind in Christ and the

mind in us, respectively, is a relation not of identity of kind, but merely of possible similitude; see below, c. 20, and c. Apollin. ii. 11.

<sup>4</sup> See Ep. Epict. 4. Apollinaris is quoted by Theodoret, and even by his own follower Timothy, as denying any change or conversion of the Godhead of the Word into "flesh" or "the nature of a body." For Timothy's quotation, see Galland, xii. 704.

<sup>5</sup> Δύσησις, see Newman, Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 279, where this passage is quoted.

unalterable. But since *Christ, according to the flesh*, Rom. 9. sprang from men, from our *brethren*, as it is written, and <sup>2.</sup> Col. 1.18. was possible, and *first-born from the resurrection of the dead*, as the Law had announced beforehand, how is it that you call that which is uncreate “possible?” or how is it that you name that which is possible “uncreate?” or when you call the uncreate essence of the Word possible, you blaspheme the Godhead: and when you apply to the possible flesh, adapted to the bones and blood and soul and throughout the whole of our body<sup>y</sup>, and made palpable and visible, the term “uncreate,” you break down in (one of) two ways; either by supposing the exhibition and the endurance of the Passion to be a mere appearance<sup>z</sup>, according to the impiety of the Manicheans<sup>a</sup>, or else you think the like of the essence of the uncreated Godhead. And then why do you censure those who imagine God to exist in a human form according to the flesh<sup>b</sup>?

4. But you say, that “it became uncreate through its union with the uncreated One<sup>c</sup>.” But thereby your error will be exhibited as self-confuted: for the union of the flesh with the Godhead of the Word took place from the womb; for from thence did the Word establish it when He came from heaven: since it had not existed before His coming, or before Mary the Mother of God<sup>d</sup>, whose

<sup>x</sup> Leontius cites Apollinaris as anathematizing those who said that the Godhead was possible, and that from it came the feelings of the soul. Galland, xii. 702.

<sup>y</sup> Καὶ ὄλου . . . σῶματος is apparently an error for καθ' ὄλου.

<sup>z</sup> Φαντασίαν=δύκησιν. See Orat. c. Ariau. iii. 32, “He had a body but φαντασία, but really;” and Ep. Epict. 7.

<sup>a</sup> See Ep. Adelph. 2. Nestorius, says Cyril, was constantly professing to be afraid “that the Manicheans would take advantage of the term Theotocos,” as if it implied Docetism: whereas those who used it believed that the Word, as Incarnate, “passed under the law of human nature.” Adv. Nest. i. 1. Leo repeatedly connects Eutychianism with Manicheism: e. g. Ep. p. 59, and 124.

<sup>b</sup> I. e. those who anticipated the Anthropomorphist fancies of Egyptian monks in the days of Theophilus and

Jerome; Socrates, vi. 7. Comp. Ath. Treat. i. 267, note on Orat. c. Ari. i. 61. Or perhaps he alludes to the Audeans: see Epiphanius, Haer. 70; Theodoret, iv. 10.

<sup>c</sup> Cp. c. 10, and Newman's *Tracts Theol.* and *Eccel.* p. 272. So Apollinaris, as quoted by Leontius, asks, “How can that which is vitally united with the uncreate, not be uncreate with it?” Such language is to be distinguished from that by which divines have set forth the dignity of the Body which was united to God: e. g. Hooker, v. 54. 9.

<sup>d</sup> The phrase “Theotocos” means, “She whose child was Himself God,” or more fully, “She of whom He Who is God was humanly born.” It is applied to the Blessed Virgin below, c. 12, and Orat. c. Ariau. iii. 14, 29, 33. See notes in Athan. Treatises, i. 244; ii. 420, 440. Cyril explains the term in reply to Nestorius; the orthodox

**C. APOLL.** descent alone is deduced from Adam<sup>c</sup>, and traced in genealogy from Abraham, and from David, together with **Gen. 2.** Joseph who was espoused to her, both of them being *one flesh*, flesh, as it is written, not by cohabitation, but by their being derived from one, for it is well attested that they continued inviolate<sup>f</sup>. Christ then is born in Bethlehem of Judea, calling Joseph, who together with Mary was from David, “father;” laid to rest in swathing-clothes, and held by Symeon in his arms in the Temple, and brought to **S. Luke** circumcision of the flesh according to the law, and *increasing* in stature. If then “it became uncreate through the **2. 52.** union,” how is it that it was not seen as fully complete, but, as the Word willed, as increase of the body took place? But to ascribe increase to Him Who is uncreate, is impious. For by “uncreate” we mean what is by nature uncreate, admitting neither increase nor diminution. But that which shared with, or was united with, the uncreate, is said to belong to the uncreate, but is not called itself uncreate, lest the benefit involved in the union should be forgotten, and the obligation of the benefit cancelled, and humanity, being still left in weakness, should fall into despair, being taught, as you hold, that it has no close tie to God, and the grace should be made to disappear. For who, on hearing that the Lord’s Body is uncreate, while he knows that he himself has been made and created, will not conceive the notion that the Holy Scriptures are false, and that he himself has no communion with Christ<sup>g</sup>? If the Uncreated One assumed an uncreated body, the first creation is in that case annulled: the archetypal<sup>h</sup> Adam, whose posterity we are to this day by succession of fleshly descent, has perished. How then did Christ render us partakers of Himself? and how is it that the Apostle saith, *For He who sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all from one?*

“reject the very notion that the Word could take a new beginning of existence from the Holy Virgin, but call her Theotocos because she gave birth to the Emmanuel, who is by nature God,” adv. Nest. i. 1. (Pusey, p. 62.)

“Apparently he understood the pedigree in S. Luke to be that of Mary.

<sup>c</sup> See *Orat.* c. Ari. ii. 70. On the

ancient belief in the perpetual Virginity of Mary, see Mill on *Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, p. 165 ff.

<sup>f</sup> Here we see how Apollinarianism is opposed in the interest of our true fellowship with Christ.

<sup>g</sup> I. e. original. The Eneratites held that Adam was not saved, Euseb. iv. 29.

5. But let no one venture to think of the Godhead of the Word, that in the same sense as it is from God, so too are we, as the most impious Arians venture to say<sup>i</sup>, or that at any rate it is so in reference to the exhibition of the flesh<sup>k</sup>, and to that *form of the servant*<sup>1</sup>, that is, of the *protoplasm*<sup>m</sup> Adam, which He assumed who was *in the form of God* (as) God. Now generally, among things made, the term “uncreated” is applied to that which never yet existed, because it has not come into being. Are you then, while you hold that flesh never did “come into being” at all in the Word, actually intending to make a negation under a well-sounding phrase, so as not to acknowledge anything in that which is “uncreated”<sup>n</sup>? For it is only the being of the Godhead which is thought of as uncreate: so that to call the uncreated being “possible,” and the possible “uncreate,” is impious. For to think that it is not by means of the union that the nature<sup>o</sup> of manhood, which has been made, belongs to the Word, but that it is coeternal, and is made equal to the nature of God by identity of nature, is impious. For the Lord exhibited flesh and blood, and bones, and a soul in pain and agitation and distress. Now one cannot say that these things are natural<sup>p</sup> to Godhead: but they came to belong to God by nature, when it pleased the Word to undergo human birth, and to reconstitute in Himself, (as) in an image of newness, that handy-work of His own which had been disorganized by sin, and corruption, and death<sup>q</sup>. Therefore

<sup>i</sup> Compare Athan. de Synod. 17, Soc. ii. 45.

<sup>k</sup> See Leontius adv. fraud. Apoll. Galland. Bibl. xii. 703. Valentinus, the moderate Apollinarian, while arguing against Timothy, the more extreme, and saying that Christ’s flesh was not coessential with His Divinity, still speaks as if the main purpose of His assumption of flesh had been to show His Divinity through a medium.

<sup>1</sup> See S. Ambrose, Ep. 46, on a discussion held with an Apollinarian. The Apollinarian had insisted on the phrase “form of a servant:” but as “form of God” must mean “the expression of Divine perfection,” so “form of a servant” must mean “the plenitude of human nature and condi-

tion.” “The Apollinarian is caught in his own net.”

<sup>m</sup> Πρωτόπλαστος, alluded to in 1 Tim. 2. 13, “Adam was first formed,” occurs in Wisdom 8. 1.

<sup>n</sup> That is, “Your phrase ‘uncreate’ may involve you in a difficulty; as if you meant that Christ’s flesh has never come to exist at all.”

<sup>o</sup> Here, implicitly, he acknowledges that the Incarnate Lord had a human nature as well as a Divine. So in Orat. c. Arian. iii. 53.

<sup>p</sup> Literally, “nature of.” Comp. Orat. c. Arian. iii. 34.

<sup>q</sup> I.e. physical corruption, the dissolution of the body; see *De Incarn. Verbi*, 3.

C. APOLL. He effected on earth the condemnation of sin, and on the tree the abolition of the curse, and in the sepulchre the redemption of corruption, and in Hades, the dissolution of death: having visited every place, that He might effect the salvation of the whole of man<sup>1</sup>, exhibiting in Himself a form resembling our own. For what need was there for God to be born of a woman, for the Maker of the ages to increase in stature and have His years numbered, or again to have experience of the cross, or the sepulchre, or Hades, to which we all had become subject, unless He was seeking us, giving us life through His form which was like our own, and inviting us to imitate and resemble a perfect image? And how would imitation of perfection be possible, if there had not preexisted the perfection which knows

Col. 3. 9. no defect? as the Apostle says, *Having put off the old*  
 Eph. 4. 24. *man, and put on the new man, which according to God has*  
*been created in holiness and righteousness of truth.*

6. Who then taught you to say "uncreated?" "If therefore a nature "becomes uncreate" by means of change, then it may become also invisible and immortal, not after death, but as being incapable of death. How then was it that the Lord died, if it was uncreatedly that the Uncreate One sojourned on earth? or how did He become visible and tangible, as it is written, *That which we have seen and our hands have handled?* How is it, then, that you say what is not written—what is not lawful even to think of? For you will furnish all heresies with an opinion like to that most impious one of him who was once called Rhetorius<sup>2</sup>, whose impiety it is fearful even to mention. Either then, deny the Divine Scriptures, or, if you acknowledge them, do not think of uttering, beside what is in Scripture,

<sup>1</sup> Gregory Nazianzen says, Epist. 101. "What was not assumed" (by the Son in the Incarnation) is unhealed: it is what was united to God that is saved. If Adam fell in half his being, then what was assumed and is saved may be only half. . . . [Here come words cited on c. 2.] . . . It is said that our mind was condemned. Is not flesh, then, condemned too? If what is inferior is assumed in order to be sanctified, shall not what is su-

perior be assumed also? . . . Mind had in fact been the first to fall in Adam, therefore mind was assumed by Christ." See too his *Orat. 22. 13.* And Ambrose; "The very purpose for which He came was to save the whole of man. *Si non totum redemit, felicit.*" Ep. 48. 5.

<sup>2</sup> See Augustine, *Heresies*, 72, that Rhetorius held that all heresies had right on their side. On this "liberalism" cf. Ath. *Treat. i. 178.*

other words of incurable deceit. But you say again, “*We* do not worship a creature<sup>t</sup>.” O unthinking men! why do ye not take account of this, that the Lord’s Body, though it was made, receives that worship which is not due to what is created<sup>u</sup>? for it has become the body of the un-created Word; for it is to Him whose body it has become that you address the worship<sup>x</sup>. Therefore it is both worshipped as of right, and worshipped as Divine, for the <sup>1 Θεϊκῶς</sup> Word to whom the body belongs, is God, since, when the women approached the Lord, He said, by way of hindering them, *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father* <sup>S. John 20. 17.</sup> indicating that an ascension was necessary, and that such ascension would be one<sup>y</sup>. Nevertheless, they approached, and *took hold of His feet, and worshipped Him* <sup>S. Matt. 28. 9.</sup> They took hold of feet, they worshipped God. It was feet of bones and flesh that they were handling, but feet that were God’s; it was God that they worshipped. And elsewhere the Lord said, *Handle Me and see, for a spirit* <sup>S. Luke 24. 39.</sup> *hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have*; and yet He Himself was Spirit<sup>a</sup>, for *God is Spirit*. And when saying <sup>S. John 4. 21.</sup> that He had them, and exhibiting them, how was it that He said, *A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me*,—He saith not “being,” but—“having”—if it were not to teach us, that the nature of Spirit is ineffable, while this handling relates to a body like ours, which He acquired for Himself from the Virgin not by a form of operation<sup>b</sup>,

<sup>t</sup> Meaning, “It is you who worship a man.” They used, says Greg. Naz. Ep. 102, to make much use of the sentence, “We must worship, not a man clothed with God, (or, carrying God,) but God clothed with flesh.” This was to them a *πρόγραμμα τῆς ὥροδοξίας*; they inscribed it over their house-doors. Of course, it had an orthodox sense; see Theodoret, H. E. iv. 8. The idea of worshipping “a man Θεοφόρος” was rightly condemned by Cyril, Anath. 5. Explan. 5. adv. Nest. i. 2, on the ground that so to describe Christ was to rank Him with the Saints. Athanasius himself speaks of Jesus as Θεὸς σάρκα φορῶν, Orat. c. Arian. iii. 51.

<sup>u</sup> Literally, “that worship which is not created.” See Ep. Adolph. 7.

<sup>x</sup> See Ep. Adolph. 7.

<sup>y</sup> i. e. that in the ascension of His Body He Himself would ascend.

<sup>z</sup> Quoting from memory, he confounds the scene in S. John 20. 17 with that in S. Matt. 28. 9.

<sup>a</sup> Compare the frequent use by the early fathers of “Spirit” for Christ’s Divine Nature, according to the use of it Rom. 1. 4. (Bull, Judgment of Cath. Church, p. 97). See Athanasian Treatises, Lib. Fath. i. 196, compare Bp. Lightfoot’s St. Clement of Rome, p. 309; and Tertullian adv. Marc. iv. 33, and Tertull. Lib. Fath. p. 322. Doubtless this use contributed to the confusion between Christ’s Godhead and the highest part of His humanity.

<sup>b</sup> Οὐκ ἐνεργεῖας τρόπῳ, i. e. not as if He simply created it by His own power.

C. APOLL. but by natural birth, that His body might both be natural, and also by way of nature inseparable from the Godhead of the Word? For thus also did the Death take place; the body was undergoing it by way of nature, but the Word permitting it by His will, and in the exercise of a right<sup>c</sup> delivering His own Body to death that He might suffer for us naturally, and rise again for us Divinely. And the whole transaction of His Nativity and Death looks to the object of seeking and recovering us.

7. This being so, and being acknowledged in the Catholic Church of God, how is it that you again say that the body was brought from Heaven<sup>d</sup>, and why did Christ do this? Tell us, was it that He might bring down a body from heaven upon earth, and make the invisible visible, and that which could not be outraged susceptible of outrage, and the impossible possible and mortal? And what benefit was involved in this, O thoughtless men, if you say that that took place in Christ which took place in the protoplast Adam, unless Christ, having appeared *in likeness of sinful flesh*, and *condemned sin in the flesh*, had restored by

Rom. 8. 3. an incomparable restoration that which fell in Adam<sup>e</sup>: so that He both lived in flesh on earth, and exhibited the flesh as incapable of sin, that flesh which Adam had in a sinless state from his first creation, and by his transgression made capable of sin<sup>f</sup>, and fell down into corruption and death? This flesh He raised up in a condition of being by nature sinless, that He might shew that the Maker was not the cause of sin, and He established it in accordance

<sup>c</sup> Ἐξουσιαστικῶς. cf. S. John 10. 18, ἔξουσιαν ἔχω θεῖναι αὐτην.

<sup>d</sup> Greg. Naz. explains "The second man from heaven" of the union (of man) with the Heavenly One, Epist. 101. Gregory of Nyssa accuses the Apollinarians of making the Word fleshly, and, the Son's Godhead mortal (c. Apollin. tom. iii. p. 262. So in his *Antirrheticos*.) Cyril Alex. explains 1 Cor. 15. 47 to mean, not that He brought down flesh from Heaven, but that He who is God came down, Quod minus sit Christus, Pusey, p. 346. And in his Ep. to John of Antioch, called "Laetentur cœli" (Pusey, p. 46) he shows that his whole line, in de-

fending the title "Theotocos," is opposed to the notion that Christ's body was brought down from heaven. Theophilus, (Pasch. Ep. 2. translated by Jerome, Ep. 98) says that "He brought from heaven nothing *nostrie conditionis*."

<sup>e</sup> Literally "the fall of Adam."

<sup>f</sup> Strictly, of course, Adam was created capable of falling, as were the Angels. That is, he had not the "non posse peccandi"—only the "posse non peccandi:" but the "non posse peccandi" belonged to our Lord's Manhood through its personal union with God. See on c. Apollin. ii. 9.

with the original<sup>g</sup> creation of its own nature, that He Himself might be the exhibition of sinlessness.<sup>1</sup> Vain, then, are their imaginations who go astray and say that the Lord's body was from heaven. Rather, what Adam brought down from heaven to earth<sup>h</sup>, Christ carried up from earth to heaven: and what Adam brought down into corruption, and condemnation to death, when it had been sinless and uncondemned, that did Christ show forth<sup>i</sup> as incorruptible, and capable of delivering from death, so that He had *authority on earth to forgive sins*, to exhibit incorruption <sup>S. Matt. 9. 6.</sup> (by rising) out of the sepulchre, and by visiting Hades to destroy death, and to proclaim to all the good tidings of resurrection, because *God created man to be immortal, and made him the image of His own eternity, but by the devil's envy, death came into the world*, and when it was under the reign of death unto corruption, He did not overlook it<sup>k</sup>, for He Himself became man; not<sup>l</sup> that He was turned into the form of man, nor that, as if neglecting real human existence<sup>m</sup>, He exhibited Himself merely under a shadow, —but He who is by nature God was born man, that these two might be one<sup>n</sup>, perfect in all things, exhibiting His birth as natural<sup>o</sup> and most true. Therefore it is said, *And He gave to Him the name which is above every name*, to <sup>Phil. 2. 9.</sup> reign over the heavens and have *authority to execute judgment*. <sup>S. John 5. 27.</sup>

8. For the Word, who is the Maker<sup>p</sup> of the universe, was seen as Son of Man, not as having become some one different, but a second Adam, that even from that name we might understand the truth. And the Apostle shows the

<sup>g</sup> Literally “archetypal.” c. 4.

<sup>h</sup> This phrase, of course, is not to be taken literally; it only means, what Adam degraded.

<sup>i</sup> Ἀνέδειξεν. It may have simply the sense of “rendered,” as in the invocation and subsequent intercession in S. Basil's Liturgy, Hammond's Liturgies Eastern and Western, pp. 114, 124.

<sup>k</sup> A touching Liturgic phrase: compare the “Clementine” Thanksgiving, ἀπολλύμενον οὐχ ὑπερεῖδες, Hammond's Liturgies, p. 14. and S. Mark's Liturgy in the parallel place, ib. p. 180. In S. James's we

have οὐ παρεῖδες ib. p. 41. The thought is expanded in Athanas. de Incarn. Verbi, 6.

<sup>l</sup> Quoted by Leontius, c. Nest. et Eutych.

<sup>m</sup> “Ταρξιν. To this word, in ad Afros 4, ὑπόστασις is made equivalent.

<sup>n</sup> I.e. one Person: ὅν εἰς ὃ τὰ ἑκάτερα, so c. 16. This clearly supports the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union.

<sup>o</sup> Φυσικήν. Not of course, that the Nativity was not, as we should say, “supernatural,” ep. ad Max. 3; but that He really became Man.

<sup>p</sup> Δημιουργός, ad Afros 4, ad Adelph. 4.

C. APOLL. “protoplasm” to have been the elder, showing that what is *psychical* is first, what is *spiritual* second. But in 1 Cor. 15. 46. speaking of “psychical” and spiritual, he does not show us two different bodies, but the same body: the first under the authority and belonging to the nature of soul, therefore psychical, but the second under the authority and belonging to the nature of spirit, therefore spiritual: for God the Word *is a Spirit*<sup>4</sup>: for so also we can understand what S. John 4. 24. is said of our case, in the words, *The spiritual man searcheth out all things, but the psychical man receiveth not the things of the Spirit.* And yet, while the body of both men is one, he shows that that which partakes of the Spirit is to be understood as spiritual, whereas he who has continued in the soul’s power alone is shown<sup>5</sup> to be psychical. And if the truth be on your side, why in the world is it that Christ is not called merely “Man,” as if He were some new one who had come among us from heaven,—but He became “Son of Man?” If then He became Son of Man on earth, and yet was born not of the seed of man, but of the Holy Spirit, He must be understood to be thought of as Son of one, the protoplasm, Adam. For besides that Adam who is from earth, no other man is regarded as having existed in heaven, so as both to have his body from heaven, and also be a Son of Man irrespectively of Adam<sup>6</sup>. Therefore Matthew records Him as son of Abraham and David according to the flesh, but Luke ranks Him in the genealogy as Son of Adam and of God. If then you are disciples of the Gospel, do not speak unrighteousness against God, but keep close to what is in Scripture, and to what took place. But if you choose to say things contrary to what is in Scripture, why do you fight against us, who do not consent to hear or say anything contrary to what is in S. John 8. 31, 36. Scripture<sup>7</sup>, as the Lord saith, *If ye continue in My word, ye shall be free indeed?*

<sup>4</sup> Here again *πνεῦμα* is used for the Divine Nature of Christ, cp. c. 6.

<sup>5</sup> The construction in the Benedictine text is irregular. On the “psychical man” see Abb. Trench, N. T. Synonyms, ii. 96.

<sup>6</sup> Alluding to the Apollinarian notion of an archetypal celestial Manhood.

<sup>7</sup> Again he insists on the entire Scripturality of the Catholic doctrine, see Ep. Joy. I. So below, he implies that what is “not in Scripture” (not capable, at least, of being distinctly proved thereby) is “alien to true religion.” But with this he combines Church authority, c. 20.

9. How then can you any longer be deemed faithful, or Christians, who neither keep close to the words of Scripture, nor believe in what took place, but venture to define what is beyond nature? *Is it a small thing for you* Isa. 7.  
*to enter into a contest with men, and how do ye enter on* 13.  
*a contest with God?* LXX For if those who disbelieved the prophets were condemned, how much more those who do not put faith in the Master Himself? For how is it that you dare to think or to speak in a different way of the things which He Himself willed and was pleased to do, for the putting away of sin and death? If we confess Him, He will also confess us; *if we deny Him, He also will deny* 2 Tim. us, *if we believe not, yet He abideth faithful, for He cannot* 2. 12. cp. S. Matt. deny Himself. For what means this extreme and wild ex- 10. 32. travagance of yours, to say what is not in Scripture, and to think what is alien from religion? For you attempt to call the flesh coessential with the Godhead, not considering that the impiety in which you involve yourselves is thus doubled. For it has come into your mind to say this, so that you should either deny the flesh, or blaspheme the Godhead, saying, in your words, "We say that He who was born of Mary is coessential with the Father."<sup>u</sup> But this phrase of yours, which you deem reverential<sup>x</sup>, shall be shown to be either superfluous or foolish. For who among the faithful will not admit that God the Word, who came among us, and proceeded as Man from the Holy Virgin Mary<sup>y</sup>, being coessential with the Father, became man of the seed of Abraham<sup>z</sup>, whose son also he is regarded to have been, and that the coessential Word of God became, according to the flesh, Son of David? Therefore also do prophets and apostles and evangelists reckon Christ in the genealogy, according to the flesh, as of the seed of David. How then can you without a blush assert that flesh, which is genealogically described as of David's seed, to be coessential with the Word? or, on the other hand, as we said, you say this foolishly, not considering that what is coes-

<sup>u</sup> As if to say, "We guard the Personal Union of God and Man in Christ; but you imperil it."

Cyril imitates Athan in Ep. ad Nest. 3. 3, "God the Word . . . προῆλθεν ἀνθρώπων from a woman."

<sup>x</sup> See ad Max. 7.

<sup>z</sup> Cf. Cyril Explan. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Cp. Epiet. 12; c. Apollin. ii. 5.

C. APOLL. sential has indeed identity of nature, but exhibits its own  
 I. perfection in itself<sup>a</sup>. For as the Son, who is confessedly coessential with the Father, is confessed to be perfect in regard to the Perfect One<sup>b</sup>,—as is the Holy Spirit: for the Trinity is coessential:—you then will assign perfection also to the “coessential flesh,” in addition to the perfection of the Word, and on your theory a Quaternity<sup>c</sup> instead of a Trinity will be proclaimed. And what is to be said of such an impious notion?

10. But you say, the flesh became coessential with the Word<sup>d</sup>. How did it become coessential? tell me. “It became the Word, and even became Spirit.” But if that which is not by nature Godhead became in fact Godhead by conversion, why do you blame Arians, who put forward the same notion as to the Word<sup>e</sup>? And yet Scripture says, *The Word became flesh*, not, *The Flesh became Word*. But it is said, *The Word became flesh*, because the flesh became that of the Word, and not of some man<sup>f</sup>; that is, God became Man; and it is said, He ‘became flesh’, lest you should pass by the name of flesh<sup>g</sup>. If then you are not content with the natural<sup>h</sup> union, apart from all confu-

<sup>a</sup> So in de Synodis 45, that the bishops at Nicaea used the phrase *Homousion* to set forth the truth that the Son is not of different nature from the Father.

<sup>b</sup> Cp. ad Afros, 11.

<sup>c</sup> This is a retort of the Apollinarian charge against the Catholics, that they imagined a Quaternity instead of a Trinity. Ep. Epict. 9; see below, c. 12. S. Ambrose makes a like retort, “Itaque quantum increatum . . . inducunt,” de Incarn. Saer. 78.

<sup>d</sup> Moderate Apollinarians disclaimed this. See Newman, *Tracts Theol.* and *Eccles.* pp. 272, 277.

<sup>e</sup> I. e. that the Son or Word was made God in an improper or titular sense, by the fiat of the Father: see ad Afros, 5; cf. c. Apoll. ii. 11.

<sup>f</sup> So Cyril, that it is “not the flesh of a man . . . connected with the Word,” Ep. ad Nest. 3. 7, and cf. Explan. 10, that Nestorians regard the Virgin’s Son as *τέρπον τινα* beside the Word.

<sup>g</sup> See Orat. c. Arian. 1. 60. “We

ascribe the ‘becoming’ to the flesh;” and ib. ii. 44, our “body which He assumed on becoming man, is Wisdom’s house, and with reason is it said by John, ‘The Word became flesh.’” S. Augustine says that “flesh” is put for “Man,” in order to emphasize the self-humiliation, de Div. Quest. 83, n. 80; ep. Orat. c. Ari. iii. 30.

<sup>h</sup> ‘Natural’ here denotes an union in which the flesh really became that of the Word’s own Person, see below, c. 11, 16. S. Cyril, Explan. Cap. 3. (Pusey, p. 246) says that a “natural union” means a “real” one; that it implies no confusion of the natures, but means the unity of Subject or Person. Theodoret, at the end of his second Dialogue, entitled ‘Ασύγχυτος, quotes passages in which Apollinaris disclaims the notion of a confusion. His comment is that “the man who was first to introduce the mixture of the natures was thus constrained by the power of truth to admit their distinctness.”

sion<sup>i</sup> between the Word and the flesh that became His own, and with the statement that God became Man; in that case, you neither hear nor wish to believe, since you are not content when you hear of that which is above all the praise that we can think of, a Body of God<sup>k</sup>, according to him who says, *Who will transform the body of our humiliation, that it may become conformed to the body of His glory*; which is an indication of the age to come: and further it is called "the body of His glory." And the Lord also says, *When the Son of Man shall come*; He means that Son of God, who became Son of Man, being both Judge of living and dead, and King, and Sovereign, and very God. But you wish to proscribe the word 'body'<sup>l</sup>, or any application of the term 'man' for Christ<sup>m</sup>. How can you go on reading the Divine Scriptures, when Matthew writes, *the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, Son of David, Son of Abraham*, and John, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*? Now if you mean to consider 'Word,' and 'God,' and 'Son of David,' as separately existing<sup>n</sup>, you will have to speak of two words: but if, being taught by the Divine

<sup>i</sup> Ασυγχύτω. Here he anticipates the great anti-Monophysite watchword of the next century, (see the Chalcedonian Definition of Faith, and Hooker v. 54. 10.) which was also anticipated by Cyril Alex. Apol. adv. Orient. 1, 11. (Pusey, p. 266, 364.) adv. Nest. i. 1. (Pusey, p. 62.)

<sup>k</sup> Ep. ad Adelph. 3. The Apollinarians, he means, were not content with the statement that an actually human body had come to belong to a Divine Person, and so attained an ineffable dignity. For the phrase, "God's Body," see on ad Adelph. 3; ep. Epict. 6; Max. 3; c. Apoll. i. 6, 18.

<sup>l</sup> So Greg. Naz. Epist. 101. The Eutychian also, in Theodoret's first Dialogue, is made to object to the phrase, "He assumed a body."

<sup>m</sup> It is true (see on c. 6) that Christ is not "a man" in the sense that any human individual is a human person (see Athan. Orat. Arian. iii. 51; Newman's Sermons, vi. 62.); but although Apollinaris himself sometimes spoke of Him as Man, the Apollinarians shrank from admitting in plain words

that He was "Man;" that He had assumed a true humanity. Compare S. Ambrose, Ep. 46, 7, that an Apollinarian had said, "He took the form of a servant, we do not read that He was a servant;" see below, c. Apollin. ii. 13. Cyril Alex. says that "the Word, although He is by nature God, has been called Man as having become partaker of flesh and blood, like ourselves, and assumed our humanity in a perfect state according to its proper law of being." Scholia, 4 (Pusey, p. 506.) Theodoret makes use of this passage, in his second Dialogue, p. 168; and also makes "Orthodox" argue that it is necessary to call Christ Man as well as God, or that it is not "superfluous" to do so. See below, ii. 18, and Newman, Tracts Theol. and Ecol. p. 262.

<sup>n</sup> Κατὰ διαιρεσίν. He means, "No doubt, if you were asked by us to admit that the Son of God and the Son of Man were two persons, that would mean two Christs: but we utterly repudiate such an idea." The doctrine of the "One Person in two Natures"

C. APOLL. Scriptures, you believe that the Word, being God, became  
 1. Son of Man, you will know that the Christ is one, the self-  
 same<sup>o</sup>, both God and Man: that the twofold aspect of the  
 announcement<sup>p</sup> of His coming might involve a convincing  
 proof alike of the Passion and the impassibility, as when  
 1 Tim. the Apostle says<sup>q</sup>, *The Man Christ Jesus, who gave Him-  
 2. 5. 6. self a ransom for all, God blessed for ever.* And writing  
 Rom. 9. to Timothy, he says, *Remember Jesus Christ, of the seed  
 5. 2 Tim. 2. of David, who was raised from the dead.* And the same  
 8. 1 Cor. Apostle says again, *We announce His death, until He  
 11. 26. come<sup>r</sup>.*

1 S. Pet. 4. 1. 11. If, then, on the strength of your acknowledging “the  
 coessential,” you take away the name of the flesh, and  
 the application of the name “Man” to Christ, either you  
 no longer “announce His death until He come,” and  
 then you nullify the Scriptures; or else, announcing, in  
 your view, the death of Him who is coessential with  
 the Father and the Holy Spirit, without acknowledging  
 that *Christ suffered in flesh*, you will say that even the  
 Godhead of the Father and of the Holy Spirit is itself  
 capable of death<sup>s</sup>; and then you have become more im-

plies that it is possible for a Divine Person to adopt a human sphere of existence in addition to the Divine, and without prejudice to the oneness of His Personality. See above, p. 85.

<sup>o</sup> Compare Tom. ad Antioch. 7; and c. Arian. iv. 36, “Not some different Christ, but one and the same.” So Hilary de Trinit. x. 19, “there is no other Son of Man than He who is Son of God: nor any other in the form of God, than He who was born as perfect man in the form of a servant.” Thus Hilary, like Athanasius, and like Ambrose in de Fide ii. 7, 58, de Incarn. Saer. 6, 48, and Augustine Enchir. 35, excludes Nestorianism beforehand, as did the Council of Chalcedon afterwards in its Definitio Fidei, “We acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ as one and the same Son, the same perfect in Godhead, the same perfect in manhood, truly God and truly Man, the same from a rational soul and a body, coessential with the Father as to Godhead, and the same coessential with us as to

Manhood,” according to the formula accepted by Cyril from John of Antioch; see Cyril, Ep. ad Joan. (Pusey, p. 44.)

<sup>p</sup> Τὸ διπλῶν κήρυγμα, comp. Orat. c. Arian. iii. 29, that the account (ἐπαγγελία) of the Saviour in Holy Scripture is twofold. And see below c. 13, and c. Apollin. ii. 2, 18. This does not mean that He is διπλός in the sense in which Cyril rejects that phrase, Ep. ad Nest. 3. 8, that is, the sense of a double personality.

<sup>q</sup> An instance of the combination of two texts. On the sense of Rom. 9, 5, see Ep. Epict. 10.

<sup>r</sup> Καταγγέλλομεν, here understood in its natural sense of announcing or making solemn acknowledgment as before men. The text is thus used in the Liturgies, see Hammond, Liturgies East. and West, pp. 42, 112, 187, 211.

<sup>s</sup> Theodoret quotes from Apollinaris several passages admitting that the death was endured by Christ’s flesh, the Godhead being impassible, Dial. iii. p. 255. See below.

pious than all the heretics. For it was the death of the flesh which became that of the coessential Word<sup>t</sup>. For it was not the Father nor the Holy Spirit that wore flesh, as those who hold the impiety of Valentinus imagine<sup>u</sup>: but "the Word became flesh." Wherefore we, in confessing Christ to be God and Man, do not say this for the sake of making a division, God forbid<sup>v</sup>! but on the contrary, according to the Scriptures, to the end that, since Passion and Death have taken place, and are being "announced until He come," we may confess the Passion and the Death to have taken place in regard to the flesh of the Word, but may believe the Word Himself to be unchangeable and unalterable<sup>y</sup>. Therefore it is He who suffered and who did not suffer<sup>z</sup>; being impassible and unchangeable and unalterable in the Divine nature, but having *suffered* <sup>1 S. Pet.</sup> *in flesh*, as Peter said<sup>a</sup>, and willed to taste of death: because *He became a Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ, who gave Himself a ransom for all*, and again<sup>5</sup>.  
 'because He became a Mediator between God and men.'

*Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.* <sup>Gal. 3. 20.</sup>

<sup>t</sup> This should be read along with e. Apollin. ii. 11. Cf. Orat. e. Ari. iii. 31.

<sup>u</sup> A lax use of "Valentinus," probably alluding to the affinity between the "emanatist" form of Sabellianism and the Valentinian scheme of *Æous*.

<sup>x</sup> See e. Apollin. ii. 10. 12. The Apollinarians accused the orthodox of asserting two Sons, a Son by nature and a Son who was afterwards added by adoption. "I know not with whom they are contending. I never yet knew of any one who said such a thing," Gregory Nyssen, e. Apollin. (tom. iii. p. 262.) He goes on to refute such a notion by arguing that a person might just as well take each Theophany in the O. T. to belong to a different "Son." But this is the Epistle containing the quasi-Eutychian passage of which Hooker doubted the genuineness, E. P. v. 53. 2. Gregory Nazianzen says, "They accuse us of breaking up the peerless and wondrous Union," Ep. 102. Similarly, in the next century the Monophysites accused their adversaries of dividing

the one Christ.

<sup>y</sup> Cyril of Alex. distinctly avers this. "Not that God the Word in His own nature suffered blows and piercings, for the Divinity is impassible: but since that body which had become His own suffered, He Himself is said to have suffered this for us; for He who is impassible was in the suffering body, Ep. ad. Nest. 2. (Pusey, p. 6.) And in Apol. adv. Orient. 12. (Pusey, p. 370, ff.) when charged with virtually holding that the Word suffered as the Word, he answers in effect, "Nobody holds this; of course the Word could not suffer as God, but only as Man, κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, and as having appropriated the conditions of the Manhood which He had assumed." So as to change, Apol. adv. Orient. 1. "They say they are afraid lest . . . any change should be supposed to have befallen the Word's Divine value. I applaud their anxiety (*δέιμα*), but, &c."

<sup>z</sup> See e. Apoll. ii. 2, Epict. 6.

<sup>a</sup> Athanasius had quotes this text in Orat. e. Arian. iii. 34, with the same purpose. See below, on Cyril's 12th Anathema.

C. APOLL. 12. Wherefore they are in error who say that the Son  
 1. who suffered is one, and He that suffered not is another<sup>b</sup>. For beside the Word there is no other that underwent  
 death and the Passion<sup>c</sup>: but the impassible and incorporeal  
 Word Himself endured to be born in the flesh of man,  
 Heb. 8. and fulfilled all things, that *He might have something to*  
 3. *offer for us*. And He is said to have *become superior to*  
 Ib. 1. 4. *the Angels*: it was not the Word Himself, the Maker of  
 the Angels, that became their superior, as if He had ever  
 been inferior<sup>d</sup>; but that “form of the servant,” which the  
 Word Himself made His own<sup>e</sup> by natural birth, rose up  
 as superior out of the generation of the protoplast, and  
 brought us into intimacy with itself, as has been said, when  
 Eph. 2. we became *fellow-citizens with the saints, and members of*  
 19. *the household of God*: and it became by nature God’s own  
 flesh, not as being coessential with the Godhead of the  
 Word, as if it were coeternal, but as having become His  
 own by nature, and inseparable by virtue of the union,  
 while it was from the seed of David and of Abraham and  
 of Adam, from whom we also are descended. But if the  
 flesh is “coessential with the Word,” and coeternal, you  
 will next have to say, in consequence, that all the creatures  
 also are coeternal with the God who created all things.  
 And how will you continue to be Christians, if you entangle  
 yourselves in such knots as these? For that which  
 is coessential, impassible, and incapable of death, does not  
 admit of union with what is “coessential” in regard to “hypostasis,” but in regard to “nature;” whereas in regard to  
 “hypostasis” it exhibits its own perfection<sup>f</sup>. So that, by

<sup>b</sup> Compare Epict. II.

<sup>c</sup> This was the one point for which Cyril Alex. contended: see his Explan. Cap. 2, 3, and Apol. ad Orient. 3, &c. It is stated by Pearson, On the Creed, art. 4; “When our Saviour fasted forty days, there was no other person hungry than that Son of God which made the world,” &c. and Hooker, v. 52, 3, “No person was born of the Virgin but the Son of God.”

<sup>d</sup> Cf. c. Apollin. 11, 15. As Cyril says, ad Pulcheriam et Endoe, 8, (Pusey, p. 270) that when He passed into the sphere of humanity, He so far

resigned His pre-eminence above the holy angels, but reassumed it at His ascension, &c. In Orat. c. Ari. ii, 59, Athan. takes it differently.

<sup>e</sup> Ἰδιοπονίσατο. See Ep. Epict. 6.

<sup>f</sup> This passage should be compared with one at the end of c. 9, where he argues that “flesh,” even if deemed “coessential with the Word,” cannot be thought to lose its own subsistence, and therefore will on their own showing be a “fourth” beside the Holy Three. So here, assuming their premiss of the coessentiality existing between the Word and the flesh of Christ, he says in effect, “The Word

that invention of yours, which you consider pious, you either deny the flesh derived from the Virgin Mother of God<sup>g</sup>, or you blaspheme the Godhead. But if your confession of the Son and of the Holy Spirit as coessential with the Father has reference to the flesh that suffered, why do you continue to blame us, as if we spoke of a Quaternity instead of a Trinity, while you yourselves, even against your will, confess a Quaternity instead of a Trinity, by saying that the flesh is coessential with the Trinity<sup>h</sup>? Your faith, therefore, is vain: for you are of the same mind with the impious Arians, while you misinterpret the text, *The Word became flesh*. Now the Word became flesh, not that the Word might be no longer Word<sup>i</sup>, but that the Word might be always Word, and at the same time, the Word might have flesh, in which He accepted the Passion and death in His human form, having gone as far as to the sepulchre and Hades; and in which also God the Word effected the resurrection from the dead, having made “exhibition<sup>k</sup>” of flesh and blood and soul through flesh that was His own and inseparable from him, as it is written, “from the seed of David.” For wherein did Marcion’s statement differ from yours<sup>l</sup>? Did he not say that the body appeared from heaven, in likeness of man, but not in reality? What else did Manichæus say? Did not he speak of it as Divine in form, as the body which had a mere resemblance to ours, but was foreign to that human

cannot be united to the flesh by ceasing to remain what He actually is: for coessentiality does not involve commixture. Grant that A is of one essence or nature with B; still, it *is* A and not B. In no case could the Divine Essence become possible or mortal: to say that it could, would be to blaspheme the Godhead, which retains its own unalterable perfection.” In this passage one must admit “that hypostasis” and “ousia” are in some sense contrasted with each other, in a manner not usual with Athanasius. There is a clear approximation to that sense of “hypostasis” which is involved in the phrase Three Hypostases; see on the Tome, 5.

<sup>g</sup> For the title Theotocos see above, c. 4. Apollinaris, quoted by Leontius,

says, “Anathema sit qui non dicit earum ex Maria.” Galland. xii. 702.

<sup>h</sup> See above, c. 9.

<sup>i</sup> So Orat. c. Arian. iii. 34, “The Word Himself remains as He is.” And c. Apollin. ii. 3, 7.

<sup>k</sup> The idea of exhibition or manifestation had been put forward by Apollinarians in their own sense, as if it were the one “object of the Incarnation,” Newman, *Tracts and Eccl.* p. 266. Hence Athanasius emphasises it, in a sound sense, repeatedly in this treatise. E.g. c. 7, 16, 17: ii. 5, 9, 10, 13, 15, 17.

<sup>l</sup> Cp. Ep. Adelph. 2. On Marcion’s Christology as “Docetic in the extreme,” see Mansel’s *Gnostic Heresies*, p. 214. He did not even allow of “a seeming birth into the world.”

C. AROLL. flesh<sup>m</sup> of which he impiously asserts sin to be the nature, not the operation<sup>n</sup>? Such is the character of their impiety.

Eph. 5. 30. 13. Therefore he who is religious ought not to employ such devices as these, but to say that the Word who before the ages was coessential with the Father did in the last times, from the Holy Virgin Mother of God, restore that which was formed and made in Adam's likeness, making it His own by union: and thus He who was God before the ages appeared as man, the Christ. And we are members of Christ, as it is written, *from His flesh and from His bones*. What then is the meaning of all these contentious inventions of yours, in that you employ human wisdom to make definitions beyond the scope of human thought<sup>o</sup>, saying, "Instead of the inward man which belongs to us there is in Christ a heavenly mind?" O what an unhallowed opinion, what weak and unbecoming words of men who do not understand in the first place this fact, that "Christ" is not spoken of in one way only, but by that one name itself is exhibited an indication of two things<sup>p</sup>, Godhead and Manhood! Therefore "Christ" is called Man, and "Christ" is called God, and "Christ" is God and Man, and "Christ" is one. Vain then is your sophism, whereby you attempt to contemplate something else in Him beside "Christ." For those who are in an im-

<sup>m</sup> Faustus the Manichean held that 2 Cor. 5, 16 was a retraction of Rom. 1, 13. S. Aug. c. Faust. xi. 1.

<sup>n</sup> See this in Newman's Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 327. According to Manes, sin was not a perverse exercise of the soul's power of action, but belonged to the original constitution of the soul itself, as including an element of "darkness." See app. to S. Augustine's Confessions, Lib. Fath. p. 322.

<sup>o</sup> They claimed to be philosophical theologians: Greg. Naz. Ep. 101, Epiph. Hær. 77, 30. Athanasius protests against over-defining in Ep. ad Serap. 1, 17, in terms which might almost seem capable of being utilised by the Acacians. It is, he says, "impossible for us men" to speak worthily about things ineffable; but it is a fur-

ther stretch of boldness to invent for them terms not found in Scripture." "A reluctance," says Card. Newman, "to fix the phraseology of doctrine . . . is historically contemporaneous with the most unequivocal dogmatic statements." Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 293. He adds that "no better illustration" of this "can be given than the writings of Athanasius himself." Compare c. Apollin. ii. 19. The inevitable inadequacy of all human terms in regard to the mystery of the Divine Being is earnestly enforced by Hilary, de Trin. ii. 5, 7, who says at the same time that heresy has constrained the Church to use such terms. Cp. Newman, Ari. p. 37.

<sup>p</sup> Above, c. 10, and below, c. Apollin. ii. 2. Cp. Theod. Dial. ii. p. 74. ff.

proper sense<sup>q</sup> called “Christ<sup>r</sup>” may perhaps be contemplated as such from your point of view, but He who is by nature the only real Christ will not be described by human reasoning, as you, who have become presumptuous, dare to describe Him. For neither prophet, nor apostle, nor any of the evangelists, has uttered these things which you who have become shameless in mind<sup>s</sup> undertake to say. For if Christ is another than the “heavenly mind” that has come to exist in Him, and the “mind” is perfect, then on your own shewing there are two (perfects<sup>t</sup>) and you are convicted of holding that opinion which you seem to denounce. As for a “heavenly mind,” even the prophets had it, for they spoke of things heavenly, and of things future as if present. But why do you so much as think of saying this, as if the existence of an inward man in Christ were not a thing acknowledged? Why then will you say of the soul, that the body and the soul are the outward man<sup>u</sup>, as one might say of the blood and the flesh? But as the body and the blood, being visible, do not escape handling and also wounding, you have to prove to us that the soul does not escape these things, inasmuch as it is also visible. Or, if you cannot prove this, the conclusion is plain, that the soul is neither seen, nor killed by man, S. Matt. 10. 28. like the body, as the Lord has said. Be convinced, then<sup>x</sup>, that the soul is our inward man, as is shewn by the original formation, and made manifest by the subsequent dissolution, this also being shewn not only in our own case, but also in the death of Christ itself<sup>y</sup>, when the body went (only) as far as the sepulchre, but the soul went on to Hades: and since the interval which separates these places was great, and the sepulchre admitted the presence of the body, it was there that the body was

<sup>q</sup> Καταχρηστικῶς, a term applied by Arians to the lax or improper sense in which according to them the Son was called Word, Athan. Deccr. Nic. 6.

<sup>r</sup> See Cyril Alex. Ep. ad Monach. 11. “All the others are with reason called christs because they have been anointed, but Emmanuel alone is Christ and very God.”

<sup>s</sup> Literally, “in soul.”

<sup>t</sup> See c. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Apollinarians held that the animal principle or ‘soul’ belonged to the outer, the rational principle or ‘mind’ to the inner man. Dorner, ii. 365. E. T. See c. Apoll. ii. 8.

<sup>x</sup> This passage is cited by Pearson on the Creed, ii. 327, to show that the Fathers argued against Apollinarianism from the descent into Hades.

<sup>y</sup> The construction is irregular, δεικνυμένων . . . εδείκνυτο.

C.ATOLL. present, while the incorporeal presence was admitted by  
Hades.

14. How was it that when the Lord was present there incorporeally, He was regarded by death as man? It was in order that, by presenting to the souls detained in bondage that form<sup>7</sup> of His own soul which was incapable of the bondage of death, as if capable of it, as present in their presence, He might fix the boundary-mark of the resurrection, and break the bonds of the souls detained in Hades<sup>8</sup>; that the Fashioner and Maker of man, and He who had subjected man to condemnation, might by His own presence, and His own act in His own form, set man entirely free. For neither did death prevail so utterly as to bring the human soul of the Word under its dominion, to be detained in bondage; nor again did corruption tyrannically rend asunder the body so as to produce its dissolution, as if events were not under the control of Providence<sup>9</sup>. For to entertain such a thought as to such a thing, is impious: but He who held the enquiry into the transgression, and gave judgment, passed the general doom in a twofold form,

Gen. 3. 19. saying to the earthly part, *Earth thou art, and to earth shalt thou depart* :—and so, the Lord having pronounced sentence, corruption receives the body:—but to the soul,

ib. 2. 18. *Thou shalt die the death* : and thus man is divided into two parts, and is condemned to go to two places. For this reason the action of Him who had pronounced sentence became necessary, that He might by His own act annul His own sentence, after He had been seen in the form of him that was condemned, but in that form as uncondemned and sinless; that the reconciliation of God to man<sup>10</sup> might come to pass, and the freedom of the whole

<sup>7</sup> Μορφὴν—the form or specific character: see c. Apoll. ii. 1; compare Phil. 2. 6. Ambrose explains “form” there as the perfection of nature and of condition, Ep. 46. 7. See below, ii. 1.

<sup>8</sup> That is, might shew them that their detention would have a limit, that they would be reunited to their bodies.

<sup>9</sup> I.e. if such an one as Christ could be supposed capable of dissolution, all

faith in a Providence would be shattered.

<sup>10</sup> Athanasius clearly considered the reconciliation of man to God in 2 Cor. 5. 19, 20 as involving (primarily) a reconciliation of God to man, (compare the next words, “not imputing,” &c.) So S. Clement of Rome, Ep. ad Cor. 48, “that He, being made propitiatory, might be reconciled to us;” and so in the “Clementine” Liturgy, “He propitiated Thee His own God

of man might be effected by means of man, in the newness of the image of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Now if you can point out another place of condemnation, you may with reason say that man is divided into three parts<sup>d</sup>, and that the recall from two places has come to pass, but that in the third that which was bound remains in bonds. But if you cannot point out another place, beside the sepulchre and Hades, from which places man has been perfectly set free, because Christ set us free in His own form which was like to ours, perfect and most real; how can you go on saying this, as if God had not yet been reconciled to mankind? How then was it that the Saviour came among us? Was it as if He were unable to set free the whole of man<sup>e</sup>? or as if He abhorred the mind which had once sinned, or feared that He Himself might become a partaker in sin, if He, being God, were to become perfect man? But those who form this notion of the case are full of impiety. For what definition of sin is that which you give when you say this, asserting like the most impious Manicheans, that sin is natural<sup>f</sup>?

15. When you hold these sentiments, you become accusers of the Maker of nature<sup>g</sup>. When God at the beginning formed Adam, did He make sin innate in him? If so, what need was there then of a commandment? And how was it that He condemned man after he had sinned? And how was it also that Adam did not know good and evil before his transgression? Him, *whom God formed for incorruption, and as an image of His own eternity*, He made with a nature sinless and a will free to choose<sup>h</sup>: *but through the*

and Father, and reconciled Thee to the world." Hammond, Liturgies, East. and West. p. 16. See Dale on the Atonement, pp. 262, 492. (the Congregationalist Lectures for 1875.)

<sup>d</sup> Athanasius here virtually reduces the "trichotomy" of "body, soul, and spirit," (emphasized in S. Irenaeus iv. 9. 1.) into a dichotomy, treating "soul and spirit" as the inward man, in opposition to "body" as the outward, See below, c. 18, and c. Apoll. ii. 17. where he identifies soul and spirit. In c. Gent. 30 he had spoken of the mind as residing in the soul. Compare Gregory Nyssen, Antirrhet. 46.

<sup>e</sup> See above, c. 5. Greg. Naz. says, Ep. 101, that the mind specially needed redemption, because, as physicians say of illnesses, it was the first part affected (by human sin:) therefore it specially needed to be assumed by the Redeemer. If God could save man apart from mind, He could do so apart from flesh.

<sup>f</sup> Above, c. 12.

<sup>g</sup> Quoted in the Sixth General Council as from the *second* book against Apollinaris. Mansi, xi. 368.

<sup>h</sup> Αὐτεξόστον. See Orat. c. Arian. i. 35. an Arian question—Αὐτεξόστος οὐτιν, οὐδὲ οὐτι;

C. APOLL. *devil's envy came death into the world*, after he had found out the device of producing the transgression. And thus, from disobedience to God's commandment, man became S. Matt. 13. 25. receptive of *the seed sown by the enemy*<sup>1</sup>, and thenceforward sin was active in man's nature, in the direction of every appetite<sup>2</sup>: not that the devil had fashioned a nature in him, God forbid!<sup>3</sup> for the devil could not be a maker of a nature, as Manicheans impiously think: but he out of a transgression produced a perversion of nature, and thus it Rom. 5. was that *death reigned over all men*. For this purpose then, 11, 14. it is said, *the Son of God came that He might destroy the* 1 S. John 3. 8. *works of the devil*. What sort of works of the devil did the Son of God destroy? Because after God had made a nature in a sinless state, the devil perverted it into transgressing His commandment, and finding out deadly sin, therefore did God the Word restore for Himself this nature in a state which it was incapable of being perverted by the devil and of finding out sin: and therefore did the S. John 14. 20. Lord say, *The prince of the world cometh, and findeth nothing in me*. But if the ruler of the world found in Christ not a single thing that was his, much more did Christ abandon to the ruler of this world nothing of His own handy-work. Or this was another reason for his finding nothing in Him,—because Christ exhibited the principle of newness in its perfection, that He might accomplish in perfection the salvation of the whole of man, of reasonable soul and body<sup>4</sup>, that resurrection also might be perfect. In vain, then, do Arians<sup>5</sup> use sophistry, suggesting that

<sup>1</sup> This allusion to the parable of the tares occurs in c. 17. ii. 6. In Orat. c. Ari. ii. 34 he connects it with Arianism, ep. Hist. Ari. 44.

<sup>2</sup> See Athan. de Incarn. Verbi, 4, 5.

<sup>3</sup> See Ath. Treat. i. 242.

<sup>4</sup> A phrase in the Chalcedonian Definition of Faith. Compare the Quicunque, "ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens."

<sup>5</sup> See c. Apollin. ii. 3, 12, and 14. Epiphanius, Ancorat. 33, says that the Arians deny that He assumed a soul that they may ascribe to God the human sensations. So Greg. Naz. Epist. 101, says, "For if the Man (Jesus) was soulless, that is what Arians also

say, in order to refer the Passion to the Godhead," see Newman, Tracts, Theol. and Eccles. p. 258, and Athan. Treatises, i. 119, where the passage in the text is quoted. In Mai's Nova Collect. vii. 17, the Arian Endoxius, bishop of Constantinople, is cited as saying, "Neither did He take a human soul, but God was in flesh instead of a soul." ("God," of course, in the Arian sense.) The "Easterns," criticising Cyril, refer to the Arians as asserting "one nature," Cyr. Apol. adv. Orient. 4. Leontius again explains their motive; "that such texts as refer to humiliation might be ascribed to Christ, not as

the Saviour assumed flesh only, and impiously referring to the impassible Godhead the notion of suffering. And in vain do you also, from another point of view, but with the same thought as theirs, say that He used the form with which He was invested, that is, which was "instrumental," and (that) "in place of the inward man that is in us, there was in Christ a heavenly mind." And how then was He in pain, and in heaviness, and praying? And it is written, *He was troubled in spirit.* Now these things do S. John 14. 21. not belong to a flesh without a mind, nor to an unchangeable Godhead, but to a soul possessing thought, feeling pain, and trouble, and in heaviness, and intellectually sensible of suffering<sup>o</sup>.

16. But if, then, you do not choose to think thus of this matter, there are three possible conceptions, unreality, and blasphemy, and reality; and which will you choose? For if you suppose that what was said was said in mere appearance<sup>p</sup>, then what took place must also be deemed unreal<sup>q</sup>. And if it was really said, but the soul of the Lord had become altogether estranged from its own thought, in that it possessed God the Word as a Mind, then to think that the Unchangeable was changed so as to feel pain, and heaviness, and trouble, is impious: and if the Gospels do say that Jesus *was troubled in spirit*, yet the Lord indicates His "mind" in the words, *My soul is troubled*<sup>r</sup>. Now if Ib. 12. the Lord indicates a thought of His own soul, He does so 27.

Man, but as Son of God, and so, according to their doctrine, the Son might be found to be inferior to the Father," de Seetis, iii. 4. (Galland, xii. 635.) See Theodoret, Epist. 104, that Arians say that the Word was itself instead of a soul, while Apollinaris, inventing a difference between such a soul and a mind, says that the mind was absent: and that Arians are refuted by the distinctions which refers the lowlier language about Christ to His "assumed nature," the loftier to His Godhead. Marius Mercator (ed. Baluz. p. 168.) ascribes this opinion not to Arius himself, but to some Arians, and to Eunomius; and thinks that Apollinaris held it at first, and afterwards, "in pejus velut emendatus," said that

Christ had an "anima" but that God the Son was His "mens." Compare Card. Newman, Athan. Treatises, ii. 383, ed. 2. 289.

<sup>o</sup> See Orat. c. Ari. iii. 56. So Basil, Ep. 261, that to flesh animated, the animal soul, it belongs to be weary; to the rational soul, or soul employing a body, to be sorrowful. Theodoret says, Hær. Fab. v. 13, that in S. John 12. 27 "He plainly expressed the agitation which the soul sustained," &c.

<sup>p</sup> Δοκήσει, cf. c. 2.

<sup>q</sup> Φαντασία. See Epict. 7; Orat. c. Ari. iii. 32; and Basil, Ep. 261. 3, "of His Humanity which was real and not κατὰ φαντασίαν."

<sup>r</sup> Quoted by Augustine to the same purport. De Div. Qu. 83, in 80.

C. AROLL. in order to sympathise with our soul<sup>s</sup>, that so we also may at the same time consider the Passion to have been His, and confess Him to be impassible. For as He redeemed us by the blood of His flesh, so too by the thought of S. John. His soul, He "exhibits" His victory in our behalf, saying, *I have overcome the world*; and, in another place, *To Him Who giveth us the victory*<sup>t</sup>. But as the blood will not be thought by religious persons, as it is thought by the unbelievers, to be common<sup>u</sup>, but to be effectual for salvation, so also what is called the thought is not beset with human weakness, but exhibits the nature of God<sup>x</sup>. And so Christ will be called perfect God and perfect Man<sup>y</sup>: not as if the Divine "perfection" had been converted into a human perfection, which is an impious notion; nor as if we acknowledged two "perfections" separate from each other<sup>z</sup>, which is alien to true religion; nor again by way of "advance" in virtue<sup>a</sup>, and an accession of righteousness, God forbid! but by way of an unfailing existence, so

<sup>s</sup> That the movement of thought or feeling was believed to be real, not merely assumed in order to show sympathy, although such sympathy was involved in it, is plain from the context, which may illustrate the reference in Orat. iii. 57 to our Lord's depreciation of "the cup," &c.

<sup>t</sup> Here a saying of S. Paul's is treated as sanctioned by his Master.

<sup>u</sup> Κοινόν, perhaps alluding to Heb. 10. 29. See Cyril Alex. Ep. ad Nestor. 3. 7, (Pusey p. 26) "not receiving it as common flesh;" and Explan. 11, "not believing what is set forth to be the body of a common man."

<sup>x</sup> I. e. it helps us to a fuller view of Him who is actually God, as His blood is efficacious through His Divinity. Cyr. ad Arcad. p. 229.

<sup>y</sup> Comp. the Quicunque, v. 32, and the Tome of S. Leo, c. 5. See Orat. c. Arian. iv. 35. ἀλον αὐτὸν ἐνθρωπον τε καὶ Θεὸν δμοῦ. Even in the Semi-Arian Macrostich, He was owned as "God by nature perfect," Athan. de Synodis. 26. So on the other hand, Epiphanius, Hær. 77. 29; "Not as if He dwelt in a man, but that He Himself became Man wholly." And Hilary de Trin. x. 59, "habens in se et totum verumque quod homo est, et totum verumque quod Deus est?"

so ib. 52. See Card. Newman's Athan. Treat. ii. 469, ed. 2. The passage in the text is quoted by Leontius, c. Nest. et Eut. i.

<sup>z</sup> See c. 2.

<sup>z</sup> The Ebionites held that Jesus was an ordinary man, justified merely κατὰ προκοπὴν ἡθούς, Euseb. iii. 27. See note in Athan. Treatises, Lib. Fath. i. 10, that a prominent tenet of Paul of Samosata was that our Lord became the Son by προκοπή or growth in holiness, (i. e. attained to a titular and ethical Sonship.) See Athan. de Synodis 26, (the Macrostich condemning the doctrine) and Orat. c. Arian. i. 43, and especially iii. 51. So Greg. Nyssen, c. Eunom. Orat. iii. says that the Word is ever King, ever Lord, ever most high, and God, not having become any of these ἐκ προκοπῆς. So Greg. Naz. Ep. 101. "If any one shall say that He was adopted as having become perfect in conduct, let him be anathema: for that which advances (προκοπτον) or is perfected, is not God." So Cyril Alex. ad Arcadiane &c. 11, (Pusey, p. 168.) "We do not say, as those do, that the Emmanuel was called God by grace . . . or attained this glory ἐκ προκοπῆς." See above, on Tome 3.

that the two should be one<sup>b</sup>, perfect in all things, the self-same God and Man. For on this account also did the Lord say, *Now is my soul troubled* and is in pain. The word "now" means, when He willed<sup>c</sup>: but nevertheless it exhibited what was in existence, for He was not mentioning what existed not as if it were present, as if what took place was spoken of in mere appearance<sup>d</sup>, for all things took place by nature and in reality<sup>e</sup>.

17. Since then the Lord became man by nature, and not by a fiction<sup>f</sup>, it is not possible for you to raise an objection with regard to 'sin,' either natural or actual, as in the Maker. For in our nature the strife of invention (of sin) and the introduction of the (evil) seed sown, are still going on, through our weakness; but the Incarnation of the Lord, having taken place in connection with the nature of God<sup>g</sup>, involved an incapacity for those ways of acting which go on in us in consequence of our "old man<sup>h</sup>," and on this account we are taught to *put off the old man, and to put on the new*. And in this consists the marvel—that the Lord became Man, and yet *apart from sin*: for He became wholly a new Man<sup>i</sup> to exhibit what He could do. And all things that He willed by (His) nature<sup>k</sup>, and arranged,

<sup>b</sup> Repeated from c. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. c. 6. "Our Lord's suspense or permission, at His will, of the operations of His Manhood is a great principle in the doctrine of the Incarnation." Athan. Treat. ii. 296, ed. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Δοκήσει.

<sup>e</sup> See c. 10.

<sup>f</sup> Θέσει, cf. Ep. Epict. 2.

<sup>g</sup> The phrase, *κατὰ φύσιν Θεοῦ*, means practically, "because He who became Incarnate was really God," or "was a Divine Person." Here, and more fully in c. Apollin. ii. 6, he meets one of the most popular of Apollinarian objections. If Christ had a human mind, how could such a mind be free from sinful tendencies? He answers in effect, "The Divine nature in Christ exempted the nature assumed by Him from all evil propensities: His manhood had nothing of the 'old man.'" It could desire, e.g. power, or freedom from pain, but not as to be attained by deviation from the will of the Father. In other words,

the human mind or spirit in Christ was made to exist apart from an independent human Ego, and apart from any principle of selfwill. On this subject cf. Epiphanius, Ancorat. 79, that, being God, He could so hold together the various elements of a complete Manhood as to make moral disorganisation impossible; and Haer. 77. 27, that all the elements of humanity were in Him kept free from taint. So Mozley on Doctr. of Predest. p. 97, that He had no sinful propensities or "concupiscence." And F. W. Robertson, Sermons, i. 116: "He had no evil propensities at all,—no tendency to sin." See below, p. 127.

<sup>h</sup> Literally, 'from the oldness.'

<sup>i</sup> Literally, 'newness.'

<sup>k</sup> Θελήσας τὴν φύσει,—as we should say, by the will of His Divine Person, compare c. Apollin. ii. 10. See Newman's Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 308 ff. that Cyril Alex. uses φύσις τοῦ Λόγου for the Divine Being in the Person of the Son.

C. A POLL. He took upon Himself, whatever things He willed<sup>1</sup>, that is, the birth from a woman, increase of stature, numbering of years, labour, and hunger and thirst, and sleep, and pain, and death<sup>m</sup>, and resurrection. Therefore also into the place where man's body underwent corruption did Jesus introduce His own body; and where the human soul was held fast in death, there did Christ exhibit the human soul as His own, that He who could not be held fast in death might at the same time be present as Man, and unloose the grasp of death as God: that where corruption was sown, there incorruption might spring up, and where death reigned in the form of a human soul<sup>n</sup>, the Immortal One might be present and exhibit immortality, and so make us partakers of His own incorruption and immortality, by the hope of resurrection from the dead: so that *the corruptible might put on incorruption, and this mortal might put on immortality*; that as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, even so by one Man Jesus Christ might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, as it is written. What then do you mean by saying, "Instead of the inward man that is in us, there is in Christ a heavenly Mind?" Do you grant that having separated the outward and the inward into two, He thus exhibited Himself both in the sepulchre and in Hades<sup>p</sup>? But it was not possible to pay one thing as a ransom in exchange for a different thing on the contrary, He gave body for body, and soul for soul, and a perfect existence for the whole of man: this is Christ's exchange, which the Jews, the foes of life, insulted at the crucifixion, *as they passed by and shook their heads*. For neither did Hades endure the ap-

<sup>1</sup> Again an irregular construction: *ἀνεδέξατο ὅτα ἡθέλησε, τούτεστι γεννήσεως.*

<sup>m</sup> I. e. in becoming Man, He placed Himself, as Man, under the law of mortality, see Athan. Treat. i. 243; ep. c. 6; c. Epict. 8.

<sup>n</sup> I. e. where the human soul, present in its reality, or true character, was an instance of the sovereignty of death.

<sup>o</sup> See above, c. 2.

<sup>p</sup> Μήτρηγε apparently has this mean-

ing here. The thought, though obscurely expressed, seems to be, "You say that Christ's soul was a Divine, not a human soul; that *this* was His inward man. Well, but Christ's inward man, whatever it was, went into Hades. Now, what was it but His soul and that a human one? For (1) He could not redeem human souls by the price of a soul that was non-human; and (2) it is expressly taught that what went into Hades was a human soul."

proach of a Godhead unveiled<sup>q</sup>; this is attested both by Psal. 16. prophets and apostles.

<sup>0.</sup>  
Acts. 2.

18. Further, the truth of these observations will be seen 31.

at a glance when we consider the dispensation<sup>r</sup> of the cross, how the Lord exhibited the reality of His flesh by the pouring forth of His blood, and by the addition of water indicated its spotless purity, and that it was the Body of God<sup>s</sup>: and by *crying aloud, and bowing the head, and yielding up His spirit*, He indicated that which was within His own body, that is, the soul; of which also He said, *I lay it down for my sheep*<sup>t</sup>. So that one would not call His breathing His last a withdrawal of Godhead<sup>u</sup>, but a departure of the soul. For if the death, and the dying of the body, took place in virtue of a withdrawal of Godhead, then the death which He died was one peculiar to Himself, and not that which is ours. And how could He descend into Hades with His Godhead not under a veil? In that case, where then was the soul, which the Lord promised to “lay down for the sheep,” and concerning which the prophets made revelations beforehand? But if what took place was a departure of the soul, then on this account it was said that He underwent the death that was ours, that is, by enduring the dissolution that befalls us, as He also endured our birth.

19. Vain, then, is your sophism: for how could His death have taken place, if the Word had not constituted for Himself both our outward and inward man, that is, body and soul? and how then did He pay *a ransom for all*, or <sup>1 Tim. 2.</sup> how was the loosening of the grasp of death completely<sup>6.</sup> effected, if Christ had not constituted for Himself, in a sinless state, that which had sinned intellectually<sup>x</sup>, the

<sup>q</sup> See c. Apoll. ii. 17.

<sup>r</sup> See Tom. ad Antioch. 7.

<sup>s</sup> Above, c. 6, 10. This is not a common explanation of the symbolism the water from Christ's side.

<sup>t</sup> Observe the two senses of  $\psi\chi\acute{\eta}$  as “soul” or “life.” So Theodoret, Hær. Fab. v. 13.

<sup>u</sup> Hence it follows that the Godhead was with the body in the tomb and the soul in Hades: the “Vital Union” having been severed

between death and resurrection,—the Personal never for a moment, c. Apollin. ii. 5, 14, 15, for it was “indissoluble,” ib. 2, 5. Gregory Nyssen dwells on this in *Antirrhēt.* 55, to the effect that as Christ was sinless in soul and body, His Divine nature remained entire in each during their temporary separation, and at the Resurrection was present in both at once, to reunite and to revivify.

<sup>x</sup> Κατὰ φρόνησιν.

C. APOLL. soul? In that case, death still "reigns" over the inward man: for over what did it ever reign, if not over the soul, which had sinned intellectually, as it is written, *The soul that sinneth, it shall die?* on behalf of which Christ laid down His own soul, (thus) paying a ransom<sup>y</sup>. But what was it that God originally condemned? that which the Fashioner fashioned, or the action of what was fashioned? If God condemned that which the Fashioner fashioned, He condemned Himself, and He would then be like to men. But if it is impious to think this of God, and if He condemned the action of the thing fashioned, in that case He annuls the action, and renews the thing fashioned. *For we are a thing of His making, created unto good works.*

Eph. 2. 10. 20. But again, you say, "It is we who call Him who was from Mary, God<sup>z</sup>." Why then do you speak as Marcion did, of God as having come to "visit" us<sup>a</sup>, and of God as having come to us intangibly, as having a nature not receptive of human flesh? Or why do you speak of God like Paul of Samosata? for this was the face which he put on his impiety, to acknowledge Him that was from Mary as "God" in this sense, that He was pre-ordained before the ages, but derived from Mary the beginning of His existence<sup>b</sup>. And he acknowledges in Him an operative<sup>c</sup> Word, from heaven, and Wisdom (thereby granting Him, on his own

<sup>y</sup> The language of "redemption" is used by Athanasius in *De Incarnatione* 2, 5; in that tract he also speaks of paying for man what was due from him, *ib.* 9, 20, and, in both places, of offering a sacrifice on his behalf. Again in *Orat. c. Arian.* ii. 67, "paying the debt in our stead." Compare Oxenham, *Cath. Doctrine of Atonement*, p. 141; and Dale on the Atonement, p. 278, who says, "Athanasius, however, had far larger and deeper conception of the nature of Christ's redemptive work than this metaphor (paying the debt) would suggest."

<sup>z</sup> They insisted that their theory alone could establish the Divinity of Jesus on a sure footing. *Cp. c. II.*

<sup>a</sup> *Cp. Tertull. adv. Marc.* iv. 7.

<sup>b</sup> Paul of Samosata, as Athanasius says, held that Christ had become (titularly) God, being a mere man, *De Synodis* 45, not having existed before His birth, *Orat. c. Arian.* i. 25.

and being in fact a "common" man, *ib.* iii. 51. See the letter of the Council of Antioch, *Euseb.* vii. 30. "He does not choose to acknowledge with us that the Son of God came down from heaven." In his own language, Jesus was a Virgin-born man in whom the Divine Wisdom dwelt more fully than in the prophets and in Moses; i.e. the indwelling, in this case, was ampler and fuller than in others: but still the relation between Wisdom and Jesus was a connection by way of instruction and participation, not of actual or personal union; see above, on *Tome*, 3. Cf. *c. Apoll.* ii. 3.

<sup>c</sup> This Word or Wisdom, according to Paul, was operative, but not personal. The six Bishops who addressed him therefore insist that it was not *ἀνυπόστατος*, but an energy living and *ἀνυπόστατος*, *Routh, Rell. Sac.* iii. 293. See on the *Tome*, 6.

impious theory, more than you do,) just as you speak of a heavenly mind in an animated body. But neither is an animated body in itself<sup>a</sup> perfect man, nor is a “heavenly mind” in itself God. For we mean by an animated body one in regard to which the name of “soul” is used with the notion of real existence<sup>r</sup>. Now a man’s body is called body, and not soul: and a man’s soul is called (soul,) and not body, each being in relation to the other, that is, spirit<sup>s</sup> to body. For it is said, *who knoweth the mind of* <sup>1 Cor. 2.</sup> *the Lord<sup>t</sup>?* The “mind of the Lord” is not of itself the <sup>16.</sup> Lord, but is the Lord’s will or counsel, or action towards something. Why then do you desire such language, *adul-* <sup>2 Cor. 2.</sup> *terating the word of God* by made-up words? But the <sup>17.</sup> Church of God has neither received nor handed down this notion<sup>u</sup>, but rather, as it is written, that that God and *Word* who *was* before the ages *with God* came among us <sup>8. John 1. 1.</sup> *at the consummation of the ages*, and was born of the Holy <sup>Heb. 9.</sup> Virgin, and of the Holy Spirit<sup>x</sup>, Son of Man, as it is written, <sup>26.</sup> *Until she brought forth her firstborn Son, that He might be-* <sup>S. Matt. i. 25.</sup> *come firstborn among many brethren, being Himself very* <sup>Rom.</sup> *God<sup>y</sup>*; that He might both suffer for us as Man, and re- <sup>viii. 29.</sup> deem us from suffering and death as God. Vainly, then do you imagine that you can effect in yourselves the renewal of that which thinks and directs the flesh<sup>z</sup>; imagining that you can do it by imitation<sup>a</sup>; not considering that ‘imitation’ is imitation of a preceding piece of work, for otherwise it could not be called imitation<sup>b</sup>. But in that it is

<sup>a</sup> Literally, ‘at once,’ = *ipso facto*.

<sup>r</sup> Ἐνυποστάτως. See on Tome, 6.

<sup>s</sup> Again he used *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα* as equivalent terms, as in c. 14.

<sup>t</sup> The Apollinarians’ comment on this text was, “ You see that ‘the mind of Christ’ is different from our own.” Epiphanius, *Haer.* 77, 31, says that it is simply amazing that they should thus misuse it. He again treats of it in *Ancoratus*, 67; and Gregory Nazianzen says, *Ep.* 132, that they are said to “have the mind of Christ” who have purified their mind by imitation of, and regulated their lives according to, that mind which the Saviour assumed on our behalf.

<sup>u</sup> See *Epict.* 3.

<sup>x</sup> Cf. c. Apollin. ii. 5. So in the first of the two Epiphanian Creeds, “of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary,” *Ancoratus ad fin.* The creed of Nicè and Ariminum had said “of the Holy Spirit, of Mary the Virgin:” *Ath. de Synod.* 30.

<sup>y</sup> As in the Nicene Creed, and in Athan. *Orat.* c. Arian. iii. 41, “He was true God in the flesh, and true flesh in the Word.”

<sup>z</sup> See above, c. 2.

<sup>a</sup> See c. 3.

<sup>b</sup> I. e. “On your theory, there is no model of a renewed human mind presented to you in Christ for your imitation: you have destroyed your exemplar.”

C. APOLL. only flesh which you acknowledge to be renewed in Christ,  
 1. you go astray and blaspheme. For if it were possible for men to effect for themselves, apart from Christ, the renewal of that which directs the flesh, (and what is directed follows that which directs it,) what was the use of Christ's coming amongst us?

21. Those also talk groundlessly who say, that the Word so came, as He did to one of the prophets<sup>c</sup>. For of which of the prophets is it true that he, being God, became man? On that theory, why did *the Law make nothing perfect*? and why too did *death reign over those who had not sinned in like manner* to the protoplasts? and why again, did the Lord say, *If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed?* Was it not in reference to that newness which was in Him, and the perfection by which we also, who have believed, are made new, as we imitate and participate in the perfect newness of Christ? But you have resorted to every device<sup>d</sup>, for the sake of making out one conclusion, that of negation. And you call the soul paraphrastically, sometimes a "mind distracted," sometimes "sin subsisting<sup>e</sup>," and sometimes you thrust it out as "a worker of sin;" and the flesh you call sometimes "uncreate," sometimes "heavenly," sometimes "coessential with the Word," in order that you may completely confirm your negation. And as Arius, having lapsed from the belief in the ineffable and most true generation of the Son from the Father, found out such terms as "passion," "cutting," and "flux<sup>f</sup>," in order that by these unhallowed words he might cast down the unstable into the pit of transgression; (for the mouth of the transgressor is a deep pit) so also

14. LXX Sabellius, who supposed the Son to have no real subsistence<sup>g</sup>, and the Holy Spirit to be non-existent, and charged his opponents with dividing the Godhead<sup>h</sup>, and making a

<sup>c</sup> Tom. ad Antioch. 7. Ep. Epict. 11.

<sup>d</sup> Cited in Newman's Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 276.

<sup>e</sup> Ἐνυπόστατος.

<sup>f</sup> All such ideas, associated by Arians with the Catholic doctrine, in order to represent it as gross and materialising, were disclaimed by Athanasius, Orat. c. Arian. i. 15, 21, &c. De Deo. Nic.

11. as by Hilary where he says that some misinterpreted the Homousion as if it meant that the Son was a "portio desecta" from the Father, &c. de Trin. iv. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Here ἀνυπόστατος is practically equivalent to impersonal, see on the Tome, 6; comp. c. Apollin. ii. 16.

<sup>h</sup> Compare the Quicunque, v. 4.

number of Principles<sup>i</sup> and Gods, settled himself in Judaical sentiments<sup>k</sup>; so also Manichaeus, disbelieving in the Lord's Incarnation, and in His becoming Man, became altogether impious, saying that man was subject to two Makers, an evil and a good: in like manner you also calumniously say, that we say there are two Sons<sup>l</sup>, and call us "man-worshippers<sup>m</sup>," or make an objection on the score of "sin<sup>n</sup>," not in order that you may be truly religious, but that you may show off your own error as making good way by help of your evil inventions, and turn away the unstable from the faith by means of your impious words. *Yet the solid foundation of God standeth, having this seal.* 2 Tim. 2. 19.

22. This I have written, dear friend, although, in the truest sense, the Evangelic tradition<sup>o</sup> being sufficient, nothing more was necessary to be written: but I have written because you asked about the faith that is in us, and also for the sake of those who like to talk at random about their inventions, and do not consider that *he who speaketh from what is his own, speaketh a lie.* Cf S. John 8. 44. For it does not come within the reach of man's mind to express the beauty or glory of Christ's body; but at any rate, it is possible to acknowledge what has taken place as it is described in Scripture, and to worship the God who is, that His love may be glorified and acknowledged, and we may have a hope of salvation, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

Those who confounded the Persons would accuse their Catholic opponents of dividing the substance.

<sup>i</sup> See on Epict. 9. Compare the Eucharistic Preface and Tersanctus.

<sup>k</sup> Here Sabellianism, as often elsewhere Arianism, is called by Athanasius Judaical. So expressly S. Basil: "Sabellianism is a Judaism," because it denied the preexistent Sonship,

Epist. 210. 3.

<sup>l</sup> Comp. Greg. Naz. Epist. 101.

<sup>m</sup> See e. Apollin. ii. 12, and above e. 11; Greg. l. c.

<sup>n</sup> See e. 17.

<sup>o</sup> Here apparently "Evangelic tradition" means the Gospels, compare Ep. Adelph. 6. But this, of course, is an unusual sense of the word.

## ON THE SALUTARY APPEARING OF CHRIST, AND AGAINST APOLLINARIS.

### BOOK II.

1. LET those who do not acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ as one, from God and man, as it is written in<sup>a</sup> the S. Luke 3. 38. Gospel, *who was Son of Adam, who was Son of God*, tell Phil. 2. 6. 7. us in what light they regard Him who existed as God *in the form of God*, and *took the form of the servant*, or how S. John 1. 14. they understand the text, *The Word became flesh and dwelt among us*<sup>b</sup>. For he who said, *The Word became flesh*, said 1 S. John 3. 16. that *He gave His life for us*. Do they suppose the Word to have undergone a conversion into flesh<sup>c</sup>, or been made “like” to soul, or to have exhibited the human form in mere semblance, as the other heresies<sup>d</sup> erroneously say? But the Apostle does not allow of this, having told us who He was, and what He received. For as “the form of God” is understood to mean the fulness of the Word’s Godhead<sup>e</sup>, so too “the form of the servant” is acknowledged to mean the intellectual nature of man’s constitution, with its instrumental system<sup>f</sup>: so that by “was” the Word should be understood, and “became” should be acknowledged to refer to the flesh, with the soul, which is called “form of a

<sup>a</sup> See c. Apollin. i. 8.

<sup>b</sup> See Proclus of Constantinople in his “Tome” to the Armenians; that both the texts, “He became flesh,” and, “He took the form of a servant,” must be held together. “The two, understood in an orthodox sense, are to us seeds of salvation. For by ‘became’ the Evangelist intimates the indivisible character of the perfect union; . . . and the word ‘took’ expresses the unchangeableness of the nature;” (i.e. that the Incarnation on the one hand was most true and personal, but that it implied no “conversion of Godhead into flesh.”) Mansi, v. 428. Cf. Cyril, adv. Orient. 1.

<sup>c</sup> C. Apollin. i. 3. Compare the Quenonique, v. 35.

<sup>d</sup> Docete. Comp. Ep. Epict. 7. Adelph. 2; c. Apollin. 3.

<sup>e</sup> All the attributes of the Godhead are included in *μορφὴ Θεοῦ*. So he says in Orat. c. Arian. iii. 6. See Lightfoot on Phil. 2. 6, that *μορφὴ* was used to denote the specific character of a thing. Abp. Trench defines *μορφὴ Θεοῦ* to be “the manner of existence of God.” N. T. Synonyms, ii. 88.

<sup>f</sup> The bodily organism being the instrument of the soul. Cf. c. Apollin. i. 2.

servant,” being understood to be a certain intellectual constitution. On this account, man, when reduced to a state of death, is called “formless<sup>g</sup>,” and is wholly dissolved, since the soul, whose nature is indissoluble, has withdrawn from the body. Wherefore Paul adduces the evidence of the intellectual nature, but John of the “instrumental exhibition” of the body; so that both might proclaim the whole mystery of the economy<sup>h</sup>. For it is plain<sup>i</sup> that the preexistent God the Word, before He came among us in flesh, was not man, but was God with God, being invisible and impassible.

2. Nor is the name “Christ” employed without reference to the flesh: for the name implies the Passion and death, as Paul writes, *If the Christ was passible, if He was first to rise from the dead*: and elsewhere he says, *Christ 23. our Passover has been sacrificed, and the Man Jesus Christ 7. who gave Himself a ransom for us.* Not that Christ is not <sup>1 Tim. 2. 5, 6.</sup> God, but that He is also Man. Therefore he says, *Re- 2 Tim. 2. member Jesus Christ raised from the dead, of the seed of 8. David according to the flesh.* And therefore Scripture, when setting forth His being, introduces both names<sup>k</sup>, inasmuch as invisibly He is thought of as, and really is, God, but visibly he is handled as, and really is, Man: not by a division of persons<sup>l</sup> or names, but by natural generation, and indissoluble<sup>m</sup> union: so that while the Passion is

<sup>g</sup> Aristotle says, Metaph. vi. 10, that the *ψυχή* of animals (that is, the essence of an animate being) “is to such a body τὸ ἔλδος καὶ τὸ τί ἦν ἐλύει,” the form and that which makes it to be what it is; and in Metaph. x. 2 he uses *ἔλδος* as equivalent to *μορφή*, as in vii. 2 the *ψυχή* is called the *ἐνέργεια* of the body, and *ἐνέργεια* is connected with *μορφή*. (These references are suggested by the Rev. H. R. Bramley, Fellow and Tutor of S. Mary Magdalene College.) Similarly S. Thomas Aquinas says, “Anima est forma corporis, dans ei totum ordinem esse perfecti,” i. e. of existing as a body and as animated. Sum. 3. 75. 6.

<sup>h</sup> See on the Tome, 7.

<sup>i</sup> Read in the Sixth General Council, March 7, 681 (Mansi, xi, 359.)

<sup>k</sup> See c. Apollin. i. 10.

<sup>l</sup> See in c. 10 another anticipative

sanction of the doctrine of the One Person and two Natures of Christ defined by the great Councils of the fifth century. Comp. Orat. c. Ari. iii. 29—32. Newman, indeed, takes *προσώπων* in both places to mean “characters,” Athan. Treat. i. 172. But in c. 10 an existence of Godhead and Manhood is distinguished from a duality *πρόσωπων*. Athan. was familiar with the use of *πρόσωπον* for what we call “person” in the Godhead, de Syn. 26, 27; and so Leoninus seems to understand him here, Galland. xii. 738.

<sup>m</sup> I. e. He will continue Man to all eternity. The phrase “indissoluble union” was distinctly admitted by Cyril’s Antiochene critics; ἀδιάρετος γάρ καὶ ἀχώριστος ἡ ἄκρα ἐνωπίς, Apol. adv. Orient. 4 (Pusey, p. 290); compare below, c. 5, 14, 15. See on c. Apollin. i. 18. Gregory Naz. con-

C. APOLL. truly acknowledged to have taken place in Him, He the self-same should be at the same time really acknowledged to be both possible and impossible<sup>n</sup>. How then could the Word being God, become "Christ" before He became Man? For if the name "Christ" belongs to the Godhead apart from flesh<sup>o</sup>, it must also be applied to the Father and the Holy Spirit: and the Passion itself will be common to Them, as some<sup>p</sup> erroneously say. Will you say that God the Word Himself, who is impassible and incorporeal, was capable of suffering and death, even before He was incarnate and became man? But how could the Son, who is coessential with the Father, and inseparable from Him in regard to the Divine Nature, be called possible, whereas He is unchangeable and unalterable, unless He had taken from the Virgin's womb the entire form<sup>q</sup> of man's constitution in Himself, and become man, that He might alone be man in suffering, and unchangeable as being God?

3. For therefore also did the anointing take place; not as if God needed an anointing, nor again as if the anointing took place without God, but that God both applied the anointing, and received it in the body which was receptive of it<sup>r</sup>. It is plain then that the Word did not become Christ apart from human flesh, by dividing Himself into a "show" of flesh<sup>s</sup> or a "likeness" of soul; but remaining what He was<sup>t</sup>, He took the form of the servant, that

denying those who say "that His holy flesh is now laid aside," Ep. 101. Epiphanius says, Christ's Manhood cannot be put off, Haer. 77. 23. In the "Reformatio Legum" some heresies are referred to as holding the contrary, p. 10. Compare the Second Article of Religion.

<sup>n</sup> C. Apollin. i. 11.

<sup>o</sup> Irrespectively of the Incarnation; see below, c. 14.

<sup>p</sup> The Noetians or Patripassians.

<sup>q</sup> Εἶδος is used in Orat. c. Arian. iii. 3, "the form . . . and Godhead of the Father;" ib. 6; "the Son is the εἶδος of the Father, the Father's εἶδος is in Him;" so too ib. 16. Here it is applied to the whole of man's nature.

<sup>r</sup> I. e. when the Holy Spirit descended on Him at His baptism, Orat. c. Arian. i. 47 (see note there, Athan. Treat. i. 218.) So Cyril Alex. ad

Aread. &c. 12, that He was named the Christ after He was anointed with the Holy Spirit, (Pusey, p. 169;) comp. Expl. 7. Yet in Orat. c. Ari. iv. 36 Athan. says that the Word was the "Chrism;" and S. Augustine says that the anointing took place, not at the baptism, but at the Incarnation, de Trin. xv. 26. "Both," says Bp. Pearson, "may well consist together," Exp. Creed, i. 179.

<sup>s</sup> See c. Apollin. i. 12.

<sup>t</sup> This momentous phrase, which recurs in c. 16, is adopted by Cyril, "Although He assumed flesh and blood, καὶ μεμενηκὼς ὅπερ ἦν, Θεὸς δηλαρέται," Ep. ad Nest. 3. 3. "Although He continued to be what He was," Expl. 2. See below, c. 16, and cf. c. 7. The phrase became a Catholic watchword in the West also; see S. Augustine, Serm. 181, (for

form not being devoid of a real existence openly manifested by means of Passion, and resurrection, and the whole economy, as has been written and made clear. Tell us then, how you suppose "God" to have come into being at Nazareth: for all heretics are wont to say this, as Paul of Samosata<sup>u</sup> acknowledges "God" from the Virgin, "God," seen as from Nazareth and as having from thence had the beginning of His existence and received the beginning of Kingship: and he acknowledges in Him a Word "operating" from heaven, and a Wisdom, and that He existed in predestination before the ages, but was manifested in actual being from Nazareth, so that, as he says, the "God over all" might be one, the Father<sup>x</sup>. Such is his impious theory. And Marcion and Manichæus say that God has come among us through the Virgin, and come forth intangibly and as being incapable of communication with human nature, which had fallen into sin, and was subject to the ruler of wickedness<sup>y</sup>: for that if Christ had taken this nature in Himself, He would both be subject to the ruler of wickedness, and would not be free from sin: but that He exhibited from Himself at His pleasure<sup>z</sup> a flesh of His own "like to ours," which was seen as having come from heaven, and which passed into the heavens, and was whole Godhead. Valentinus, again, speaks of suffering as common to the Trinity, imagining the flesh to be a part of Godhead<sup>a</sup>. And Arius<sup>b</sup> acknowledges flesh alone, in order to a concealment of the Godhead, and says that instead of that inward man which is in us, that is, the soul, the Word came to exist in the flesh:—for he dares to ascribe to the Godhead<sup>c</sup> the idea of suffering and the resur-

Christmas Day) "Eum assumpsisse quod non erat, et permanisse quod erat:" Serm. 186, "manens quod erat." So Card. Newman, Ath. Treat. ii. 426. ed. 2; "All that He ever had continued to be His: what He took on Himself was only an addition," &c. cf. ib. 384.

<sup>u</sup> C. Apollin. i. 20.

<sup>x</sup> That is, that Jesus, as a titular God, might be absolutely separated from the one true God, the Father. The notion that He preexisted only in God's foreknowledge is condemned in

the "first Sirmian" creed, anath. 5.

<sup>y</sup> This, with both, was the lord of matter or principle of evil. As to what "sin" meant for Manes, and what interpretation his system gave to the work of Jesus, see S. Aug. Conf. Lib. Fath. p. 322.

<sup>z</sup> See Athan. Treat. ii. 297. ed. 2.

<sup>a</sup> See on Epict. 5.

<sup>b</sup> Cp. c. Apoll. i. 15.

<sup>c</sup> Not, of course, to the real Godhead, but to the supposed created Godhead ascribed by Arians to the Son. See on Ad Afros, 5.

C. APOLE. rection from Hades. And Sabellius expresses the opinions  
 of Paul of Samosata and his followers: for, dreading the  
 division invented by Arius<sup>a</sup>, he fell into the error which  
 destroys (the personal distinctions<sup>c</sup>.) Now to whom do  
 you attach yourselves, or whom do you mean to assist?  
 Or are you as the saying is, “of a mixed race<sup>f</sup>? ” For by  
 disbelieving the “union<sup>g</sup>,” you have come to terms with  
 all the above named heresies: and by denying the “com-  
 pleteness<sup>h</sup>,” you have gone the length of destroying, while  
 professing to dread “division.” Now as those who di-  
 vide are mad, and those who abate are in error, so those  
 who destroy are lost: for the Economy<sup>i</sup> took place, and  
 the truth was manifested, and the grace was attested, as  
 real.

4. Why then do you employ sophistical pretexts? why  
 do you use hypocritical concealment<sup>k</sup>, and not say openly  
 that he did not “become man, having taken the form of the  
 servant,” but that He “was seen as (if) man<sup>l</sup>? ” This ques-  
 tion is suggested by your language, when you repeat, by  
 way of pretext, “the same” and “the same.” For this  
 reason you calumniously attempt to run down the true  
 economy, saying, “They call Christ a man who was dei-  
 “fied<sup>l</sup>. And what do they make of the text, *In the be-  
 “giuning was the Word*: and, *He took the form of a servant*,  
 “and became man? It is said to mean either a man who  
 “was with God, or a man closely linked to God<sup>m</sup>, or a man

<sup>a</sup> “Sabellius” is rhetorically used  
 for the Sabellians of that period, as  
 “Arius” for some of the Arians.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. the Tome, 6.

<sup>f</sup> Πάμφυλοι. Plat. Polit. 291.

<sup>g</sup> The real union of Godhead with  
 a human body and mind: Apollinari-  
 ans, as Athanasius adds, professed  
 to be zealous for a “union,” in their  
 own sense, a “thorough union,” and  
 accused the Catholics of dividing  
 Christ into two persons.

<sup>h</sup> Apollinaris is quoted in Mai, Nova  
 Collect. vii. 310, as saying that Christ  
 was not whole man nor whole God,  
 but a μεσάντης of God and man, as  
 spring is a μεσάντης of winter and sum-  
 mer. “Apollinarians (have withheld  
 the truth) by maiming and misinter-  
 preting that which belongeth to His

human nature.” Hooker v. 54. 10.

<sup>l</sup> See on the Tome, 7.

<sup>k</sup> Greg. Naz. says that “when they  
 spoke out to their initiated, they hard-  
 ly allowed even flesh to the Saviour,”  
 Ep. 102.

<sup>l</sup> The Apollinarians accused the Ca-  
 tholics of believing in this deification  
 of a man, of being “Man-worshippers.” See on Ep. Epict. 2, Ep.  
 Adelph. 3. It was what Paul of Sa-  
 mosata had held; and it was involved  
 in the theory of Nestorius. So Pro-  
 chus, in his discourse on the Incar-  
 nation, truly said, “We do not adore  
 a deified man, but an Incarnate God.”  
 Compare Cyril, adv. Nest. i. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Συμπλακέντα. This was what Nes-  
 torius meant by his term συνδεσία,  
 the combination or association of two

“who died for the world, and was part of the world, or a man not separate from sin, or a man holding sovereignty over Angels, or a man worshipped by the creation, or a man who is Lord, as the Apostle says, *Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ*, or a man crucified, being also Lord of glory, or a man to whom is said, *Sit on My right hand*, or a man coming to pronounce judgment.” This is your *thick and upsetting potion*<sup>n</sup> which you give to men *Hab. 2. 15.* and make them drink. Question then the Jews, so that after hearing from their lips these words uttered against Christ and those who have believed on Him, you may blush; and learn too from the other heretics who say and think the same things<sup>o</sup>. Let us have a full view of the dogmas of the heretics, and the conclusions of your own “intelligence<sup>p</sup>,” and the doctrine of our faith, and the definite rule<sup>q</sup> of the Gospel, and the preaching of the Apostles, and the testimony of the prophets, and the general view of the economy as fulfilled.

5. Tell us then, how is it that you say that “God” came into being from Nazareth, affirming with Paul of Samosata a sort of beginning of existence for the Godhead, or with Marcion and the other heretics denying the nativity of the flesh: not walking in a line with the definite teaching of the Gospel, but choosing to *speak from your own resources?* *S. John 8. 44.* For this is your motive for saying, “God was born of the Virgin,” instead of “God and Man,” according to the Gospel definition, that you may not, while acknowledging a nativity of flesh, call it “natural<sup>s</sup>,” and in so speaking keep to the truth, but may speak of a “God” as having

Persons “linked in amity,” Hooker, v. 52, 2. As Cyril wrote to him, Ep. ad Nest. 3. 5, it was quite inadequate. Cf. Explan. 2.

<sup>n</sup> See the Tome, Nest. 8. and Ep. Epict. 1.

<sup>o</sup> I. e. “take warning by finding that you misrepresent us just as enemies of the faith misrepresent all Christians.”

<sup>p</sup> They boasted of their intellectual depth and versatility, c. Apollin. i. 13. Cf. Newman, Tracts Theol. and Eccl. p. 263.

<sup>q</sup> “*Opus* in this sense is often applied to a dogmatic formulæ. Thus

Socrates uses it, i. 8; ii. 10, 20; v. 4; vi. 23. Athanasius speaks of the *Opus* of the (Nicene) fathers, *de Syn. 13.* So Cyril calls the Nicene Creed the *Opus* of the right faith, Explan. 1; and the Chaledonian formulæ is called *Opus*.

<sup>r</sup> He must not be understood to condemn such phrases, “God was born,” but only the exclusive use of them (cf. Theodoret, *Dial.* i. p. 17.) He himself repeatedly uses the phrase *Theotocos*, as c. Apollin. i. 4, 12, 13. Cf. Hooker v. 53. 4, and see below, c. 13.

<sup>s</sup> See c. Apollin. i. 10, where “natural” amounts to “real.”

C. APOLL. been born, and having "shown" flesh of His own, as if in mere appearance<sup>t</sup>. For God does not "exhibit" a beginning of existence from Nazareth: but He who existed before the ages, God the Word, was seen as man from Nazareth, having been born of Mary the Virgin, and the Holy Spirit<sup>u</sup>, in Bethlehem of Judea, from the seed of David and Abraham, and of Adam, as it is written: having taken from the Virgin<sup>v</sup> all that God originally fashioned and made in order to the constitution of man, yet without sin: *Heb. 4. 15.* as also the Apostle says, *In all points like to us, yet without sin*: not "exhibiting" a conversion of the Godhead<sup>x</sup>, but effecting a renewal of the manhood, according to His own will: so that the *Gentiles should be of the same body and jointly partakers of Christ*, as also the Apostle writes: that man might be truly God<sup>y</sup>, and God might be truly man, that He might be truly Man and truly God: not that "a man was with God," as you calumniously say, disparaging the mystery<sup>z</sup> of Christians: but that God, the Only-begotten, was pleased by the fulness of His Godhead, to set up again for Himself, from the Virgin's womb, through a natural birth and an indissoluble union<sup>b</sup>, the originally formed man<sup>c</sup>, and (to make) a new handywork, that He might perform the business of salvation in men's behalf, working out the salvation of men by suffering and death and resurrection.

6. But you say<sup>d</sup>, "If He assumed all, then assuredly "He had human thoughts: but it is impossible that in "human thoughts there should not be sin: and how then "will Christ be 'without sin?'" Tell us then; If God is the maker of thoughts which lead to sin, to God we must refer<sup>e</sup> His own production: for He came to refer to Him-

<sup>t</sup> Δοκήσατε, see Ep. Epict. 7. &c.

<sup>u</sup> C. Apollin. i. 20.

<sup>v</sup> Ep. Epict. 5.

<sup>w</sup> C. Apollin. i. 3. They represented the Catholics as holding this.

<sup>x</sup> See Card. Newman, Ath. Treat. ii. 328, ed. 2. "While it be true to say, 'Man is God,' as well as to say, 'God is Man,' it is not true to say, 'Man became God,' . . . as it is true to say, 'God became Man.'" So S. Thos. Aquin. Sum. 3. 16. 7. that we cannot say

"Man became God," in the proper sense of such words. See below on c. 7.

<sup>y</sup> I. e. the sacred revealed truth, the "mystery of godliness" or of true religion.

<sup>z</sup> See c. 2; comp. c. 14.

<sup>c</sup> Ἀρχέτυπον, c. Apollin. i. 4.

<sup>d</sup> See c. Apollin. i. 17. The chapter in the text is cited in the acts of the Sixth General Council, Mansi, xi. 361. See on c. Apoll. i. 17.

<sup>e</sup> Literally, "attach."

self what He Himself had made; but in that case the judgment which condemns the sinner will be unjust, for if God made thoughts which lead to sin, how can He condemn the sinner? and how is it possible for any such judgment to proceed from God? And if Adam was subject to such thoughts before he disobeyed God's commandment<sup>f</sup>, how could he be ignorant of good and evil? He was rational by nature, and free in thought, without experience of evil, knowing only what was good, and as it were a "solitary<sup>g</sup>" being: but when he disobeyed God's commandment, he became subject to thoughts leading to sin; not that God made the thoughts which were taking him captive, but that the devil by deceit sowed them<sup>h</sup> in the rational nature of man, which had come into transgression, and was thrust away from God; so that the devil established in man's nature both *a law of sin*, and <sup>Rom. 7. 23, 7.</sup> death as reigning through sinful action; *for this cause*, <sup>1 S. John 3. 8.</sup> then, did the Son of God come *that He might destroy the works of the devil*. But you say, "He destroyed them in that He sinned not." But that is not a destruction of sin<sup>i</sup>. For the devil did not originally produce sin in man in order that when He came into the world, and sinned not, sin might be destroyed: but the devil produced sin by sowing it in the rational and intellectual nature of man. Therefore it became impossible for that nature, being rational, and having sinned voluntarily, and incurred condemnation to death, to recall itself to freedom<sup>k</sup>: as the Apostle says: *What was impossible for the law, in that it was weak through the flesh*. <sup>Rom. 8. 3.</sup> Therefore the Son of God<sup>l</sup>, came to restore it by His own act, in His own nature<sup>l</sup>, by a new beginning and a wondrous "generation:" not by

<sup>f</sup> Although he was created capable of falling into sin, he was endowed with full power to withstand it, and had in fact been free from it.

<sup>g</sup> Μονότροπος, alluding to Ps. 68 (LXX. 67) 7.

<sup>h</sup> Ἐπισπείρας, alluding to the parable of the tares. Cp. e. Apollin. i. 15, 17, and Ath. Treat. ii. 274, ed. 2.

<sup>i</sup> Unless the Son had assumed the inward nature of man, and thereby redeemed it, His own simply Divine

sanctity would have presented to it no point of contact whereby it could have been rescued from the power of sin.

<sup>k</sup> See Athan. de Incarn. Verbi. 7.

<sup>l</sup> Φύσις here, as elsewhere, e.g. c. 10. indicates the Divine Nature of Christ, in which He existed as God, and with which He entered on His redemptive work, super-adding to it a true humanity. In De Syn. 52. it means His Person.

C. APOLL. making a partition of the original constitution<sup>m</sup>, but by contradicting that principle of contradiction<sup>n</sup> which had Isa. 7.16. been "sown in" with it, as the Prophet testifies saying, *Before the child shall know good or evil*, He refuses evil in order to choose good. But if sinlessness had not been seen in the nature which had sinned<sup>o</sup>, how could sin have Rom. 8. 3. been *condemned in the flesh*, when that flesh had no capacity for action<sup>p</sup>, and the Godhead knew not sin? And Rom. 5. 20. why did the Apostle say, *Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound*, (not as if describing a place, but indicating a nature) that, he says, *as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so by one Man, Jesus Christ, might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life*: so that the nature by which the advance of sin took place, might be the very nature<sup>q</sup> through which the exhibition of righteousness should take place; and in this way, the works of the devil might be destroyed by the emancipation of man's nature from sin, and God might be glorified?

7. But again you say, "If Christ is man, He must be a part of the world: and a part of the world cannot save the world." What a fallacious notion! what a blasphemous absurdity<sup>r</sup>! For let them say from what Scripture comes this dictum, or sophism of the devil, since the Prophet says, *A brother redeems not, a man shall redeem*<sup>s</sup>; and elsewhere, *And a man was born in her, and the Most High Himself founded her*. How then can it be that Christ, who became man, did not save the world? when it is plain indeed that the nature in which sin was gene-

<sup>m</sup> I.e. not as if the evil thing, sin, which had no place in Him, was part of man's nature, so that He left a part of that nature unassumed.

<sup>n</sup> Literally, "rejecting that refection." The Tempter, he means, had infused into man's soul a disposition to set aside, or abrogate by self-will, the law of God. This disposition was now itself set aside, or abrogated, by the absolute sinlessness of Christ.

<sup>o</sup> Cited in note to Athan. Treatises, i. 241.

<sup>p</sup> Not being human, having no human mind to act through it.

<sup>q</sup> Here, in the same chapter in

which Christ's Godhead is called His *φύσις*, the term is also applied to His manhood, as in Orat. c. Arian. iii. 53, 58. Cp. c. Apollin. i. 12; and see below, c. 11. See Card. Newman, Athan. Treatises, ed. 2, ii. 428, and Tracts Theol. and Ecol. p. 311.

<sup>r</sup> There is a play of words, *ἐπίνοια*, *ἀπίνοια*, as if to say, "To have such a thought in your mind, is to go out of your mind."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>s</sup> Here *λυτρώσεται ἀνθρώπος* is understood affirmatively, not interrogatively, and the Psalmist's meaning is misapprehended. So in the Vulgate; but not in Jerome's Psalter.

rated is the nature in which *the abundance of grace* has Rom. 5. taken place. Now what is the abundance of grace? It <sup>17.</sup> consists in this, that the Word, remaining God <sup>t</sup>, became Man, in order that having become Man, He might be believed to be God: as Christ, being Man, is God, because being God, He became Man <sup>u</sup>, and in form of man saves those who believe. *For if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* Now God is incapable of being put to death, nor does He need resurrection, but He raises from the dead. Wherefore it became necessary that God *should have something which* Heb. 8. 3. *He could offer up* for us <sup>v</sup>, either in death or in life: so that it is just because the Word became man, that He saved us.

8. But again you say, “But how can the nature which had become accustomed to sin, and has received the transmission <sup>y</sup> of sin, be without sin? It is impossible: Christ, on that view, will be like one among men.” This was what Marcion also thought: this was the conclusion which Manichaeus also brought forward, placing the flesh and the very birth, of man under the sway of the ruler of wickedness, and entitling him “Potentate<sup>z</sup>:” since he by whom one 2 S. Pet. is overcome is he to whom one is brought into bondage. <sup>2. 19.</sup> These are they whose opinions you are reviving, while by a different method you give over the intellectual nature of man, which is understood to be the soul, and define it to be incapable of escaping sin, and have in the plainest terms described the soul as “fleshly<sup>a</sup>,” on whose authority I know not, for this cannot be found in the Holy Scrip-

<sup>t</sup> Above, c. 3.

<sup>u</sup> See Orat. c. Arian. i. 39; “It was not that being man, He afterwards became God: but, being God, He afterwards became Man.” The Macrostich Creed is quite right in saying, “not first man and then God, but first God and then becoming man for us,” Ath. de Syn. 26.

<sup>v</sup> This bears out the tenth anathematism of Cyril, which insists that the Word Incarnate is Himself (as Man), the High Priest of men. See Cyril, Ep. ad Nest. 3. 9; and Expl.

10. that “the limits of humanity” as assumed by Him “called Him to this function.”

<sup>y</sup> Διαδοχὴν. This transmission is just what the Pelagians denied.

<sup>z</sup> Ἐξουσιαστὴν. The Manicheans called “the prince of the kingdom of darkness” by various names, one being, says Augustine, c. Faust. xx. 9, “Spiritum potentem.”

<sup>a</sup> They had associated body and soul as making up the outward man. c. Apollin. i. 13.

C. A. POLL. tures, nor in the general sense of men, since the Lord says,  
 S. Matt. <sup>11.</sup> *Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to*  
 10. 28. *kill the soul.* And if the soul is as you say, "fleshly," why  
 1 S. Pet. does it not die and decay with the body? and again, why  
 3. 20. did Peter call the souls detained in Hades "spirits," say-  
 ing, *He went to announce the good news of the resurrection*  
*to the spirits shut up in prison*<sup>b</sup>. But you apply to every-  
 thing the phrase "contrary to nature," in order to avoid  
 giving a natural account of the Economy, and so stating  
 the truth about the Word, that the Word truly became  
 Man. For you have said that it is God's voice that says,  
 Gen. 8. *The mind of man is sedulously devoted to evil from youth;*  
 21. LXX. not understanding that by saying, "from youth," He in-  
 dicated what was "sown in afterwards" and perishable.  
 Acts 2. Therefore did *the Lord swear a faithful oath unto David,*  
 30. *that of the fruit of his body He would raise up the Christ*  
*after the flesh:* not to be "seen as" a man in consequence of  
 a change of Godhead <sup>c</sup>—for then what need was there for the  
 Lord to swear unto David? but as having taken the form  
 Gal. 4. 4. of the servant, when He submitted to be *born of a woman*,  
 S. Luke and to *grow in stature* as we do, as the Apostle says, *Since*  
 2. 52. *then the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He also*  
 Heb. 2. *Himself likewise partook of the same.* "Likewise," be-  
 14. cause not from seed, but from the Spirit; "of the same,"  
 because not from any other source, but from the seed of  
 David, and of Abraham, and of Adam, as it is written.

9. Why then, passing by the Holy Scriptures, and the  
 manifestation of the truth, do you say, "If He was not of  
 "His own will seen as a man" <sup>d</sup>, but took human existenc<sup>e</sup>  
 "and became man, then He was combined <sup>f</sup> with a man,

<sup>b</sup> A very "lax" quotation. Compare Cyril Alex. de Recta Fide ad Theodos. 22, (Pusey, p. 70.) "while He preached to the souls in Hades, He had a garment of His own, that soul which was united to Him."

<sup>c</sup> I.e. a "conversion of Godhead into flesh," in consequence of which He would look like a man, although His Manhood was not real, &c.

<sup>d</sup> I.e. "if He did not merely, by an act of the will, exhibit Himself in the likeness of man;" and see below, c. 12. They insisted on Phil. 2. 7.

Theodoret answers, The likeness was dependent on the form, which, in regard to man, as to God, implies nature, Dial. i. p. 42.

<sup>e</sup> "Ταπεξιν used, as in ad Afros 4, for ὑπόστασις or οὐσία.

<sup>f</sup> Συνήφθη, see above, on c. 4. So Apollinaris said, "If God συνήφθη with a man, then there are two, one Son by nature, the other by adoption" (θετός.) Greg. Nyss. Antirrhet. 42. Nestorius in effect admitted this conclusion, Cyril adv. Nest. i. 2. compared with ii. 8. Athan. says in Orat.

“and then also the Lord of glory, who was crucified, must be a man.” If then you listen to Peter when he says, *This Jesus, whom ye crucified, hath God made Christ and Lord,* to what do you refer the “making?” If to the Godhead of the Word, why do you still blame Arians, when you think as they do<sup>g</sup>? If to that form of the servant which existed in the Word, why do you contradict yourselves? But this is not your belief, for you say again, “If “the nature which had sinned did not sin when it came to “exist in God, it must needs have been constrained, by “necessity; but what is constrained by necessity is under “duress.” Tell us then: if the condition of *not* sinning is produced by necessity, then to sin is according to nature; therefore you must grant that the Maker of nature is a producer of sin. But if such a statement is blasphemous, and sinning happens by virtue of necessity<sup>h</sup>, it is clear that *not* to sin is according to nature. Therefore it is not by necessity, but by nature and power, that the form of the servant which was seen in the Godhead of the Word exhibits its sinlessness, having broken through the barrier of necessity, and *the law of sin*, and having led away captive the tyrannical author of captivity, as the prophet says, *Thou art gone up on high, Thou hast led captivity captive.* <sup>Rom. 7. 23.</sup> For the Word, putting forward the form of the servant against the enemy, won the victory through that which had once been defeated. Therefore also Jesus went completely through every form of temptation, because He assumed all those things that had had experience of temptation<sup>i</sup>, and by them won the victory in men’s behalf, say-

iv. 6, “The Word συνήφθη to us.” as Greg. Naz. uses συνήφθαι in Ep. 101. but their contexts show that they held the personal oneness.

<sup>g</sup> See Orat. c. Arian. ii. 11.

<sup>h</sup> He uses “necessity” here for a constraining force, overbearing the operations of “nature;” and such a power he recognises in the propensity to evil superinduced on man’s original “constitution” by the Fall, see *De Incarnatione Verbi*, 7. The point here argued is, “Sin is not of the essence of manhood.” The Pelagians took it up in a perverted form, and

accused Augustine of denying it, and so of reproducing Manichaeism, see S. Aug. c. duas Epist. Pelag. ii. 2. Athanasius’ language gives them no countenance; on the contrary, they could not have accepted his teaching about “the law of sin.” When he says, “Not to sin is according to nature,” he means, “it is the normal state of man, which was set aside by the Fall.”

<sup>i</sup> I. e. both body and mind. But in assuming them, He did not incur “peccability;” there was in Him no “concupiscence” (see Mozley, quo-

C. APOLL. ing, *Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.* For S. John <sup>ii.</sup> it was not with the Godhead, which he knew not<sup>k</sup>, that 16. 33. the devil engaged in warfare, for he would not have ventured on this; (therefore he said, *If Thou art the Son of S. Matt. 4. 3.* God;) but with man, whom he had long before been able to seduce, and from that time had directed against all men the operations of his wickedness. And since Adam's soul was detained under sentence of death, and was continually crying out to its Lord, and those who had been well-pleasing to God, and had been justified by the natural law<sup>l</sup>, were detained with Adam, and were mourning and crying out with him, God, taking pity on man whom He had made<sup>m</sup>, was pleased through the revelation of a mystery to work out a new salvation for the race of men, and to Wisd. 2. effect the overthrow of the enemy, who *through envy* had 24. deceived them, and to exhibit an incalculable exaltation of man by his union and communion with the Most High in nature<sup>n</sup> and truth.

10. Therefore the Word, being God, and the Maker of the first man, came that He might become Man, in order to give life to man, and to overthrow the unrighteous enemy, and was born of a woman, having restored in Himself the form of man as at first created<sup>o</sup>, by an "exhibition" of flesh without carnal desires and human thoughts, as a representative of renewal. For the will belonged to the Godhead only<sup>p</sup>, since the whole nature of the Word

ted above, p. 109) "no trace of original sin, and no affinity with evil," Hutchings, *Mystery of the Temptation*, p. 116. These were excluded by the relation of His Manhood to His Person. Yet that Manhood could feel, very intensely, cravings both physical and moral, innocent in themselves, as to which the question would arise, Could they not be gratified without prejudice to the law of obedience? There could not, even for a moment, be a question of gratifying them in conscious opposition to that law. See Hutchings, pp. 121—140.

<sup>k</sup> Compare S. Ignatius, *Ephes.* 19. Mill on the *Temptation*, p. 63.

<sup>l</sup> See *Rom.* 2. 14. Compare *Origen* c. *Cels.* v. 37.

<sup>m</sup> So in *De Incarn. Verbi*, II. *ελε-*

*ησας πάλιν τὸ γένος τὸ ἀνθρώπινον*, speaking of the gift of the knowledge of God.

<sup>n</sup> Φύσει here means "in reality;" c. Apollin. i. 16, 17, and ep. ib. 7.

<sup>o</sup> Literally, "from the first formation." See c. 5.

<sup>p</sup> See this in Newman's *Tracts Theol.* and *Eccles.* p. 329; comp. *Ath. Treat.* ii. 332, ed. 2. The Monothelite Macarius adduced this passage in the eighth sitting of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *Mansi*, xi. 364; but, it was remarked, without the context as to the whole of the first Adam being assumed by the second. The desires or thoughts excluded by Athanasius from the Manhood of Christ are such as are sinful. Compare c. Apollin. i. 17. An actual

(was present) under the exhibition of the human form and visible flesh of the second Adam, not by a division of persons<sup>q</sup>, but by the real existence of Godhead and Manhood. For on this account did the devil draw near to Jesus, as to a man, but not finding in Him a token of the old “seed sown” in man, nor any success of his immediate attempt, he was defeated, and gave way in confusion, and being enfeebled, said, *Who is this that cometh from Edom*, that <sup>Is. 63.</sup> <sup>1.</sup> is, from the land of men<sup>r</sup>, walking *with force and strength?*<sup>1.</sup> Therefore also the Lord said, *The prince of this world com-* <sup>S. John</sup> <sup>14. 30.</sup> *eth, and findeth nothing in Me.* And yet we are taught that the Second Adam had both a soul, and a body, and the whole of the first Adam. For if the word “nothing” had referred to the real being of man, how came he to find

denial of a human will in Christ would have been out of place in an argument against the Apollinarians, who put that denial into a pointed form; see Apollinaris quoted by Greg. Nyss. Antirrhet. 31. In the De Incar. et c. Arian. c. 21, ascribed, but improbably, to Athanasius, there is an express assertion of two wills, one human, the other Divine, the human deprecating suffering, the Divine ready for it. This passage was read in the ninth sitting of the Council as Athanasian, Mansi, xi. 381: again in the tenth sitting, ib. xi. 400. Another passage of Athanasius, professing to be a comment on “Now is my soul troubled,” was read in the fourteenth sitting, ib. xi. 597; and clearly asserted two Wills, one Divine, the other human, the latter being that which Christ calls His own in S. John 6. 38, the former inseparable from the Will of God, for whereas all men have more or less “wrenched themselves away from the will of God, in Christ alone was preserved the inseparability of the will,” (The absolute identity of the Divine will of the Son with that of the Father is strongly accentuated.) This passage was quoted by three Cypriot bishops, who said that the tract whence it was taken existed entire in their country as part of the contents of “the book of S. Athanasius;” but they had also found the same tract, on “Now is my soul troubled,”—in a very old MS. of different Homilies of Athanasius, which they

had found during the Council’s sittings. Part of the passage—“It was necessary that the will of the flesh should be moved, but should be subjected to the Divine Will;” and “calling the will of the flesh His own, for the flesh became His own,” was embodied in the dogmatic formulary of the Council, Mansi, xi. 637. If the text were to be pressed strictly against a human will in Christ, a contradiction would follow at once, for it ascribes to Christ the “form of man;” but this has been defined above, c. 1, to mean the whole intellectual constitution of man, and He possessed the whole of the first Adam: and the context has urged that Christ took in a sinless state “the nature which had sinned;” but that nature must have included a will, of which sin was the misuse. What Athanasius means to assert is, that Christ had not “the law of sin,” cf. c. Apollin. i. 7, and that all His volitions were absolutely in accordance with the will of God. “A twofold ‘voluntas’ is quite compatible with a single ‘volitio,’ ” Klee, quoted by Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 263.

<sup>q</sup> See c. 2. and c. Apollin. i. 11. Athanasius seems to mean, Not that there are two Persons, God the Word and a human Jesus, but that Godhead and Manhood did really exist in the one Person of the Saviour. Compare the Quicunque, v. 34.

<sup>r</sup> Is there a confusion of Edom with Adam?

C. APOLL. the visible body of Him who said “nothing?” But he did  
 II. not find in him the things which he himself had produced  
 in the first Adam; and thus was sin destroyed by Christ.

1 S. Pet. Therefore also the Scripture testifies, *Who did no sin, neither was guilt found in his mouth.*

11. Why then do you say, “It is impossible<sup>5</sup> that man, who has once been made captive, should be set free from captivity,” so as to ascribe impotence to God and power to the devil, while you say, like the rest of the heretics<sup>6</sup>, that sin cannot be destroyed in the nature of men, and that therefore the Godhead, which was not made captive, came in the “likeness” of soul and flesh, that it might remain itself out of captivity, and so righteousness might be seen as “clear?” When then was the righteousness of the Godhead not “clear?” And what benefit was hereby conferred on men, if it was not in identity of being<sup>7</sup> and newness of nature that the Lord was seen, as the Apostle says,

Heb. 10. 20. *The way which He made new for us, fresh and living,* (saying)  
 S. John 14. 6. *I am the way, and the life, and the truth?* But you say that those who believe are saved by likeness and by imitation, and not by the renewal and the “firstfruits<sup>8</sup>.”

Col. 1. 18. *Why then did Christ, who is the head of the body, the Church,* become *firstborn among many brethren, and firstfruits of them that slept?* For a faith which has its object in full view cannot be called faith: but faith is that which believes the impossible to be possible<sup>9</sup>, and the weak to be strong, and the possible to be impassible, and the corruptible to be incorrupt, and the mortal to be immortal.

Eph. 5. 32. *This mystery is great,* as the Apostle says, *but I speak in reference to Christ and to the Church.* For the Godhead came not to justify itself, for it had not sinned: but He

<sup>5</sup> A sample of the à priori assumptions, to which Apollinarians resorted.

<sup>6</sup> Probably alluding to the Manicheans, c. Apollin. i. 11.

<sup>7</sup> Τιμόρεως.

<sup>8</sup> See c. Apollin. i. 2. Herein the Apollinarians approached the Pelagian ground, which ignored any mystical union between Christ, as Second Adam, and his members. Dorner contends that Apollinaris himself did not Pelagianize. See Newman, *Traets Theol.* and *Eccel.* p. 273. “Much as it

is to have a perfect pattern set before us, how is this pattern practically available unless an inward grace is communicated from His Person to realize this pattern in us?”

<sup>9</sup> Literally “to be in power,” &c. He means, that Christian faith must have for its object not merely that personal holiness of Christ which was so self-manifested, but the whole of His mysterious work for the restoration of man.

who was rich, became poor for our sakes, that we, through His poverty, might be rich<sup>a</sup>. And how did God become poor? When He assumed to Himself the nature<sup>a</sup> which had become poor, and, while retaining His own righteousness, put this nature forward to suffer for men while it was superior to men, and was manifested from among men, and had become wholly God's. For if He had not been born as firstborn among many brethren, how could He have been seen as *firstborn from the dead*? How then can you say, "The God who suffered and rose again through flesh?"<sup>18</sup> Alas for the extravagance and the blasphemy! Such audacious language belongs to Arians. For they fearlessly put forward this blasphemy, having learned to call the Son of God "God" in an unreal sense: and yet Scripture teaches that the Passion took place by means of God, in His flesh, and not that God suffered through flesh<sup>b</sup>.

12. How then can you, who begin by promising to acknowledge the coessentiality<sup>c</sup>, degrade the indivisible

<sup>a</sup> This text is used also in the De Incar. et. c. Arian. 11. being "for-  
merly rich, that is, God," &c. Cyril  
Alex. often dwells on it, ad Pulchri-  
tanic, &c. (Pusey, p. 268); Quod unus  
sit Christus (p. 315); adv. Theodor.  
10 (p. 472) &c.

<sup>a</sup> See above, c. 6.

<sup>b</sup> This appears *prima facie* inconsis-  
tent with ad Epict. 6, and Orat. c.  
Arian. i. 60; comp. ib. iii. 32, "The  
Passion is said to be His," (the  
Word's.) Compare Card. Newman,  
Ath. Treatises ed. 2. ii. 328, 367, that  
Athanasius uses "He" (*αὐτός*), or  
"His," where "the next century would  
have spoken of His Person. But  
Athanasius, in the text, aims at bar-  
ring out the Apollinarian conception  
of some change or alteration effected  
in the one impassible Godhead itself,  
by the assumption of a body of a hea-  
venly and not human origin. He is  
not retracting his former assertion  
that the sufferings of Christ's flesh  
were "referred" to His Divine self, by  
virtue, as Cyril would say, of hypos-  
tatic union. (see Cyril Art. 12.) He  
is but objecting to the unbalanced use  
of expressions which, without expla-  
nation, might lead to Patripassianism,  
or to an Arian debasement of the idea  
of God. In other words, he means

to say, "When you refer the suffer-  
ings of Christ's flesh or soul to Him-  
self, because that flesh and soul were  
His, do not use the term 'God' abso-  
lutely, lest people should think you  
are speaking of the whole Trinity,  
and of the Godhead as such. Say  
rather, God the Word," &c. The  
passage, and the stronger statement  
at the end of c. 13, must be read in  
connection with c. Apoll. i. 11, "It  
is He who suffered and who did not  
suffer, &c. and ib. 5. Compare Epi-  
phanius, Haer. 77. 22. (So the expres-  
sion "Mother of God," used without  
explanation, has often been miscon-  
strued.) Proclus writes to the Arme-  
nians, "In regard to the Godhead,  
the Trinity is coessential and impassible:  
for when we say, He suffered, we  
do not mean, He suffered in regard to  
the Godhead, for the Divine Nature is  
incapable of any suffering: but con-  
fessing God the Word, one of the Tri-  
nity, to have become incarnate," &c.  
Mansi, v. 429. See the next words  
in c. 12. Compare c. 5. and 13, and  
c. Apollin. i. 11: and see Athanasian  
Treatises, ii. 330, 368, ed. 2.

<sup>c</sup> They said in effect, "It is only  
we who can guard the Homousion."  
It is not usual with Athanasius in his  
doctrinal writings, to dwell on the

C. APOLL. Name to a condition of suffering? degrading to that condition, and acknowledging as risen again, the undivided Nature, the ineffable Godhead, the unchangeable and unutterable coessentiality? For if the Word, having made flesh, by a change, out of Himself<sup>d</sup>, went so far as to suffer without having taken on Himself anything possible or capable of resurrection, then it must be He Himself that suffered and rose again from the dead: and the Passion must have been, as Valentinus thought<sup>e</sup>, common to the whole Trinity, since the Word in regard to the Divine nature is inseparable<sup>f</sup> from the Father. But if you choose to think thus of these things, what becomes of the promise of the prophets, or the genealogy of the Evangelists, or the testimony of the martyrs, or the mention of Mary the Mother<sup>g</sup>, or the growth in stature, or the exhibition of His eating food, or the indication of the universal sympathy<sup>h</sup>,

1 Tim. 2, or the application of the Name, or such phrases as—"the Son of God became Son of Man," or *the Man Jesus Christ*,

5. S. Mark 8. 31. *who gave Himself a ransom for us*," or *the Son of Man must suffer many things and be killed, and the third day rise again from the dead*? But if you do not believe that Christ was possible because He was man, yet impossible because He was God, but, when driven into a corner, argue, that if you confess Christ to be God and Man, you will be saying, "Not one, but two<sup>i</sup>," you must necessarily either (like Marcion and the rest of the heretics) call the economy of the Passion and the Death and Resurrection a mere appearance<sup>k</sup>; or like Arius<sup>l</sup> and his followers, call the Godhead of the Word possible.

13. For if<sup>m</sup>, while reading the Divine Scriptures, you have observed how, in the law and prophets, and the Gospels, and the Apostles' writings, everywhere they first call

term, while urging the ideas which it represents: see Athan. Treatises, ed. 2, ii. 56; "In his three orations he hardly names the Homoousion, though the doctrine which it upholds is never out of his thoughts."

<sup>d</sup> I. e. a body of Divine substance.

<sup>e</sup> Valentinus is often rather loosely referred to. Here the allusion seems to be to the Valentinian myth, as to Achamoth and her sufferings, see Mansel's *Gnostic Heresies*, p. 184.

<sup>f</sup> So in *Orat.* Ari. iii. 16, 4.

<sup>g</sup> Cf. *Epiet.* 4.

<sup>h</sup> Observe this reference to such a text as *Heb.* 4, 15, the force of which was annulled by Apollinarianism.

<sup>i</sup> See e. Apollin. i. 11, 21. Eutychians made the like objection. Theod. *Dial.* i. and iii.

<sup>k</sup> Διδύητιν.

<sup>l</sup> C. 3, and e. Apollin. i. 15.

<sup>m</sup> The sentence is unfinished.

the Lord “Man,” and then mention His Passion, in order that they may not utter at any time a blasphemous word against the Godhead; therefore they have neither spoken of the “generation”<sup>2</sup> of the Godhead of the Word, but acknowledge a Father, and proclaim the Son, and reckon Christ in His descent from Mary, as Son of David and of Joseph according to the flesh, by the assumption of the form of the servant, in order that His humanity may be believed to be from men, and He may be acknowledged as God the Word from God the Father, bearing the sufferings that He bore on behalf of men in the possible form received from men, exhibiting His impassibility in the body which suffered, His immortality in that which died, His incorruption in that which was buried, His victory in that which had been tempted, His newness in that which had waxed old,—because *our old man was crucified with Him*; <sup>Rom. 6. 6.</sup> for in this consists the grace; and nowhere does Godhead admit suffering apart from a suffering body, nor exhibit disturbance and distress apart from a distressed and disturbed soul: nor does it feel heaviness, and pray, apart from a mind that is in heaviness and praying. But indeed, although what has been mentioned did not happen through any failure of nature<sup>3</sup>, yet what took place was so done as to indicate real existence. Why then have you written that it is “God that suffered and rose again through flesh?” for if it is God that suffered and rose again through flesh, you must call the Father also, and the Paraclete, possible, since Their Name is one, and the Divine nature is one<sup>4</sup>.

14. But from this expression one can perceive your drift to be that of men who do not fear God, nor obey the Divine Scriptures. For Moses writes about God, *Our God* <sup>Deut. 4. 21.</sup> *is a consuming fire*, but about His coming among us in flesh, he speaks of the Lord as about to *raise up a Prophet* <sup>Ib. 18.18.</sup> *from among your brethren*, and of *life as hanging on the tree* <sup>Ib. 28.28.</sup>, as it were the Body of the Lord, given to be unto

<sup>2</sup> I.e. of the Divine Nature.

<sup>3</sup> If pressed rigorously, this would tell against his own use of such phrases as “God’s Mother” and “God’s Body.” He must be understood as deprecating the naked unex-

plained use of the assertion quoted.

For its truth when explained (as repeatedly by S. Cyril), see Hooker v. 53. 4. Cf. above on c. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Here he attaches “on the tree” by way of gloss (and with reference to

C. APOLL. life for us <sup>q</sup>: and Isaiah loudly proclaims concerning God,  
 Isa. 40. *God the great<sup>r</sup>, the eternal, He who constructed the ex-*  
 28. *tremities of the earth, will not hunger nor be weary*, and so  
 Ib. 53. 3. on: but about the Passion, *A man under a stroke, and*  
*knowing how to bear infirmity.* And what is the meaning  
 of “knowing how to bear infirmity?” It means that by  
 that which suffered, that which was capable of suffering  
 Ib. 8. 1. was exhibited. For on this account also He saith, *Write*  
*with the pen of a man in the new volume<sup>s</sup>, and not of*  
*flesh without form<sup>t</sup>.* And the Apostle also says, (The)  
 1 Tim. 2. *Man Christ Jesus who gave Himself.* Therefore also to  
 5, 6. the phrase, *of the seed of David*, he adds a mention of  
 Rom. 1. the resurrection, using the phrase *according to the flesh*;  
 3. but of the Godhead he says, *For the Word of God is living*  
 Heb. 4. 2. *and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword.* And  
 the Lord also refers the Passion to the Son of Man, indicating  
 that it is according to the flesh: but of His Godhead  
 S. John 10. 30. He says, *I and the Father are one<sup>u</sup>*, and, *No one knoweth*  
 S. Luke 10. 22. *who the Son is but the Father only<sup>v</sup>.* And nowhere have  
 the Scriptures conveyed to us any invention of “blood of  
 God” apart from flesh<sup>y</sup>, or of God having suffered, and  
 risen again “through flesh.” These are the audacious say-  
 ings of Arians, since they do not acknowledge the Son of  
 God to be Very God<sup>z</sup>. But the Holy Scriptures speak  
 plainly of “blood” and “suffering” as in the flesh of God,  
 and belonging to the flesh of God made Man, and of a

Gal. 3. 13.) to the LXX. *ζωται ἡ ζωὴ*  
*σου κρεμαμένη*, Deut. 28. 66. This  
 strange piece of mysticism is found in  
 de Incarn. Verbi, 35, and elsewhere,  
 see Athan. Treat. ii. 302.

<sup>q</sup> *Eis ζωὴν ἡμῖν γενομένου.* Probably a reference to some such Liturgic prayer as that in S. Mark's Liturgy, “Make the bread the Body . . . and the cup the Blood . . . ἵνα γένωνται πᾶσιν  
 ἡμῖν . . . eis κοινωνίαν . . . ζῶσ; Hammond, Liturgies East, and West, p. 188.

<sup>r</sup> “The great” is not in LXX. This text is cited as referring to the Son's Divinity, Orat. c. Ari. i. 12.

<sup>s</sup> *Τόμος*, LXX.

<sup>t</sup> *Αμύρφων*, cf. c. 1. He means, not of flesh without a soul.

<sup>u</sup> See ad Afros, 7.

<sup>x</sup> See Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 251, on the whole of this text. “The Son alone has a *true* knowledge of the Father.”

<sup>y</sup> Hence it is argued that Athanasius did not read Θεοῦ in Acts 20, 28. But what he says is, Scripture does not attribute “blood” to “God” δίχα σαρκός, (see c. 2.) i.e. without reference to the Incarnation, or, except to the Son as having become Man: and the received text there implies such a reference, for the “purchasing of the Church” is a result of the Incarnation. See Scrivener, Introd. to Crit. N. T. p. 416. Comp. Cyril Alex. ad Theodos. 39. (Pusey, p. 132.) “although after the union He be not thought of δίχα σαρκός.”

<sup>z</sup> See c. 3; and c. Apoll. i. 15.

resurrection of God's body <sup>a</sup>, a resurrection from the dead. But you say the very contrary, as if you were wiser than the Apostles, and more spiritual than the Prophets, and had better right to speak than the Evangelists, or even higher authority than the Lord, while by language falsely called reverential <sup>b</sup> you deny the truth, and speak against the Godhead, whereas the economy was plainly exhibited on the Cross, and His flesh was proved to exist by the effusion of blood: when a voice was uttered, and soul was indicated, not manifesting any severance of Godhead, but indicating the putting to death of the body; for the Godhead did not desert the body in the sepulchre, nor was the soul separated from it in Hades <sup>c</sup>. For this is the meaning of what was said by the mouth of the Prophets, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hades, nor wilt Thou give Thy Holy One to see corruption.* Therefore also the Lord said, *No one taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself*, that is, "I being present, declare this."

15. Therefore by the soul of God the grasp of death was loosened, and the resurrection from Hades was effected, and was announced as good tidings to the souls: and in the body of Christ corruption was annulled, and incorruption was displayed from the sepulchre <sup>d</sup>. So that neither was Man <sup>e</sup> separated from God, nor did God announce that He would abandon Man, nor was the dying,

<sup>a</sup> C. Apoll. i. 10, 18: Ep. Adelph. 3.

<sup>b</sup> Apollinarianism began in a mistaken reverence, a onesided zeal for the dignity of our Lord. See Athan. Treat. ii. 147, ed. 2. And cf. c. Apollin. i. 9. So Nestorianism regarded an actual Incarnation as unworthy of God; "he shrank from confessing the condescension of God, that He did not abhor the Virgin's womb," Dr. Pusey's Sermons on Faith, p. 61: compare Cyril Apol. adv. Theod. 10. So in Ep. ad Nest. 2. he alludes to those who reject the personal union as *ἀκαλλῆ*.

<sup>c</sup> Compare c. 1, 5: c. Apollin. i. 18. See the Coptic Liturgy of S. Basil: its confession of faith, (made by the celebrant, holding three particles of the Holy Sacrament in his elevated right hand,) has some traces of Monophysitism, but does not go beyond Atha-

nian teaching in the words, "I verily believe that His Divinity was not separated from His Humanity, no, not for a single hour, nor for the twinkling of an eye." Hammond, Liturgies, p. 229. See Pearson on Creed, ii. 328, "Capreolus, bishop of Carthage, writing against the Nestorians, proveth that the soul of Christ was united to His Divinity when it descended into hell."

<sup>d</sup> See de Incarn. Verbi, 9.

<sup>e</sup> *Ἄνθρωπος* here, as elsewhere in Athan. (as c. 19, and specially in Orat. iv.) and other Fathers, is used for *ἀνθρωπότης* or manhood. There is a similar use of "homo," beginning with Tertullian, and going down to Leo. The Greek use is well illustrated by Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. 3. 75, "The martyr resigning cheerfully *τὸν ἄνθρωπον*," i. e. his human life.

Ps. 16.  
10.

S. John  
10. 18.

C. APOLL. and the departure of the spirit, a withdrawal of God from  
 II. the body, but a separation of soul from body: for therein  
 was our death described. But if God was separated from  
 the body, and its death was exhibited under that condition,  
 how was it that the body, when separated from the incor-  
 ruptible God, could exhibit incorruption? and how did  
 the Word also make His entrance into Hades? or how  
 did He exhibit His resurrection from Hades? Did He  
 Himself rise again in place of the soul that is ours, so as  
 to construct a mere likeness of our resurrection? Nay,  
 how is it possible to imagine this of God? Your state-  
 ment<sup>f</sup>, then, is out of harmony with the holy Scriptures,  
 and your opinion is incongruous with the economy that  
 Ps. 110. was fulfilled. And the words, *Sit on My right hand*, do  
 1. not express the dignity of a man, but of God: but since  
 the dignity of God has become the dignity of Man, there-  
 fore in order that the dignity of Man might be believed  
 to be the dignity of God, it is said, *Sit on My right hand*,  
 S. John 17. 4. and, *Glorify Me, O Father, with the eternal glory*<sup>g</sup>. He  
 does not say this as if He was separated from that glory,  
 but as having come to exist in a body that was not glo-  
 rious, that He might exhibit the form of the servant as  
 not separate from the Divine glory, but as showing it  
 Ib. 12. forth. Therefore it is said, *And I have glorified it, and I*  
 28. *will glorify it again*, signifying that the glory which existed  
 prior to the body was one with that which dwelt in the  
 Heb. 1. body, as the Apostle says, *Having become so far superior*  
 4, 5. *to the Angels, as He hath inherited a more excellent name*  
*than they*<sup>h</sup>. *For unto which of the Angels said He at any*  
*time, Sit on My right hand!* Assuredly the Word, who is  
 the Maker of the Angels, did not become inferior to them  
 as if He had been inferior, but by exhibiting that form  
 of the servant, which had risen up in Him, as superior  
 to the Angels, or indeed to the whole creation: since,  
 Col. 1. being the *Image of the invisible God*, He became *firstborn*  
 15. *of all the creation*<sup>i</sup>, as it is also written in the Gospels,

<sup>f</sup> Literally, definition, *θέσις*.

<sup>g</sup> A lax quotation.

<sup>h</sup> On this text see c. Apollin. i. 12.

<sup>i</sup> Athanasius, Orat. c. Arian. ii. 62, explains this text to mean, that the

Word (1) by entering into relations with the creation in its first origin,

and (2) by His action as its spiritual Restorer, became the "brother" or representative of "many."

Until she brought forth her firstborn Son. Therefore also S. Matt, in Him were all things created, and in Him the Passion <sup>1. 25.</sup> took place, and He is the Deliverer from suffering and death, and through Him all things came into being, *and* Col. I. <sup>16, 18.</sup> *He is the Head of the body, the Church, who is firstborn* <sup>16, 18.</sup> *from the dead, that He Himself, it is written, might become pre-eminent in all things.*

16. In what sense then, according to you, did the Word, who is the Maker of all rational natures, having united flesh to Himself, become rational man, and how, being unchangeable and unalterable, did He become man, if it was not<sup>k</sup> by constituting the form of the servant so as to be endued with reason, so that the Word<sup>l</sup> might be unchangeable, remaining what He was,<sup>m</sup> and also the man, being God, might be seen on earth as rational? For the Lord is "Heavenly Man," not by having exhibited His flesh as from heaven, but by having bestowed a heavenly condition on that flesh, which was derived from earth<sup>n</sup>. Therefore also, *as is the Heavenly One, such are they that are heavenly*, by their partaking of His holiness. Therefore also, the attributes of the body were appropriated by Him<sup>o</sup>. But you say again, "How was it that they *crucified the Lord of glory*<sup>p</sup>, and yet in your view did not crucify the Word?" God forbid! on the contrary, they set at nought the Word, when they nailed to the Cross the body of the Word<sup>q</sup>. For it was God who was set at nought, but it was the soul and flesh of God that went through suffering and death, and resurrection. Therefore the Lord said to the Jews, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up*: as the prophet says, *Because His soul was delivered unto death*, and not the Word Himself; and John says, *He laid down His soul for us*. How then were the Jews <sup>1 S. John 3. 16.</sup> able to destroy the temple of God, and to break up the in-

<sup>k</sup> Literally, "and not having constituted" &c.

<sup>l</sup> Here we have *λογικὴν, Λόγος, λογικός*.

<sup>m</sup> *Μένων ὁ ήν.* See c. 3.

<sup>n</sup> So Greg. Naz. explains this text as relating to *τὴν πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔνωσιν*, Epist. 101.

<sup>o</sup> *ἀκείωται.* See note on Ep.

Epict. 6. So Cyril, Ep. ad Nest. 3. c. 6; and again in his Scholia, 36, "God appropriates the things that belong to man, by the Union;" and Quod unus sit Christus, (Pusey, p. 405.)

<sup>p</sup> On this text, see on Ep. Max. 1.

<sup>q</sup> See above, c. 14, and c. Apollin. i. 10, 18.

C. APOLL. dissoluble union<sup>r</sup> of the flesh with the Word, if, as you hold, this was the way in which the process of dying took place? For the body would not have become dead, if it had not been separated from something. For if no dissolution took place, neither did death: and if no death took place, neither did resurrection. Grant, then, the dissolution, and the separation from the body which took place, as it is written in the Gospels that *He breathed His last*, and that *He bowed His head, and gave up His spirit*; that we may see what sort of spirit you suppose to have departed from the body, and how the dying took place. For you have said, "The Word, having united<sup>s</sup> to Himself a flesh which had no subsistence<sup>t</sup>, exhibited the truly rational and perfect man." If then it was the Word that departed from the body, and this was the mode in which the dying took place, the Jews did prevail against God by dissolving the indissoluble union. Consequently, it was not the death that is ours that there took place, if the dying of the body took place after God was parted from it. And how could the body, thus parted from the incorruptible God, continue uncorrupt? On this view, the wounding will indeed belong to the body, but the Passion to the Word. For on this account you even speak of God as having suffered<sup>u</sup>, using language in consistence with yourselves, or rather in harmony with the Arians, for this is what they assert<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>r</sup> Σύγκρασις is here used not for mixture or fusion, but simply for union, as Greg. Naz. uses it in Ep. 101, 10. So Origen uses ἀνακράσει in c. Cels. iii. 41; and Gregory Nyssen speaks of the Son as ἀνακιράμενον with our nature, Catechet. 27; and Greg. Naz. strikingly, "Preserve the whole of man, καὶ μίξον τὴν θεότητα," Ep. 101. Cyril Alex. explains that some Fathers used the term κράσις laxly, not in the sense of ἀνάχυσις, as when liquids are blended with each other: "I believe you (Nestorians) of that apprehension: that was not in their minds, they were only anxious to express τὴν εἰς ἄκρον ἔνωσιν," adv. Nest. i. 3. (Pusey, p. 72.) Μίξις is described by Gregory Nyssen, Antirrhet. 51, as the union of things which are by nature diverse. Misceo and commisceo are similarly

used without the sense of fusion, in Irenaeus, iii. 19.1. Cp. Tertull. Apol. 21, (Homo Deo mixtus) and adv. Mare. ii. 27; and note in Tertull. Lib. Fath. p. 48; Cyprian, de Idol. Vaniate. 11, and Augustine, Epist. 137, s. 11. Theodoret gives instances in which things are said to be in this sense commingled without being confounded, Dial. ii. p. 115. In some passages quoted by Theodoret, Dial. ii. p. 170, Apollinaris himself repudiates the idea of any actual change or fusion as wrought by the Union. For the "indissolubleness," see c. 2.

<sup>s</sup> Συγκερδας, see above.

<sup>t</sup> Ἀνυπόστατον, c. Apollin. i. 21. The flesh thus thought of, was not real human flesh. See on Tome, 6.

<sup>u</sup> Comp. c. 11.

<sup>v</sup> Comp. c. 11, 14.

S. Luke  
23, 46.  
S. John  
19, 30.

And moreover, according to you, it will be the Word who was raised up by resurrection. For it must needs be that some one received power to begin the resurrection from the dead, in order that the resurrection and dissolution of death, and the release of the spirits there detained<sup>y</sup>, might be perfect.

17. But if it was the Word who suffered this, then what became of His unchangeableness and unalterableness? And why was the Word, when seen without a veil in Hades<sup>z</sup>, accounted as man in death? And why did the Lord say to the Jews, “I will raise it up,” and not, “I will rise again from Hades<sup>a</sup>? ” for if the Word, on becoming dead, was in need of some one to raise Him from death, the victory will not belong to Him, but to the person who raised Him up. And again, why did He utter through the Prophets predictions about His soul? Why did the Lord, when He came, say, in fulfilment of the promise, *I lay down my soul for My sheep<sup>b</sup>*,—that soul which the Holy Scriptures clearly represent as being a spirit<sup>c</sup>? and the Lord moreover spoke of *the body* as being *killed* by men who yet were *not able to kill the soul*, because it was a spirit. It was the *spirit* in which Jesus was *troubled*: it was the “spirit” that departed from the body on the cross. And by this means the body became dead, and its dissolution took place, while God the Word remained unchangeably both with the body and with the soul, and with Himself who was in the bosom of the Father, so as to exhibit unchangeableness<sup>d</sup>. And in that form which is ours, and which belonged to Him, He there depicted the death which is ours, in order that in it He might also arrange the resurrection which should take place on our behalf: by exhibiting His soul on returning from Hades, and His body from the sepulchre, that in death He might overthrow death<sup>e</sup> by the exhibition of a soul, and in the grave might abolish corruption by the burial of a body; exhibiting immortality and incorruption

<sup>y</sup> Here comes in the idea of a release of souls from Hades as effected by our Lord's “Descent.” See Pearson on Creed, ii. 334.

<sup>z</sup> I. e. on the Apollinarian theory, His Godhead was present in Hades unveiled by a human soul. c. Apollin.

i. 17, 18.

<sup>a</sup> But He did say, “He shall rise again,” meaning Himself.

<sup>b</sup> See c. Apollin. i. 14.

<sup>c</sup> C. Apollin. i. 16.

<sup>d</sup> Above, c. 14.

<sup>e</sup> See our Easter Preface.

C. APOLL. from Hades and from the grave; having traversed our path  
 16. in that form which is ours, and unloosed that hold which  
 pressed heavily upon us. And herein lay the wonder: for  
 in this the grace was bestowed. But you, who acknow-  
 ledge flesh only, are unable to prove either the condemna-  
 tion of sin, or the overthrow of death, or the completion of  
 resurrection, or the unchangeableness of the Word; because  
 you have gone outside the Holy Scriptures<sup>f</sup>, uttering the  
 sophisms of Arians, although the mention of a “soul”  
 occurs plainly in Holy Scriptures, and the economy was  
 fulfilled with an exhibition of all that could fulfil and  
 complete it.

18. But some heretics, while they acknowledge Him  
 who was seen, disbelieve in His Godhead<sup>g</sup>: and others,  
 acknowledging Him as God, deny His Nativity in flesh:  
 and others, acknowledging His flesh as well as Godhead,  
 deny the presence of His soul, and have become like to the  
 frenzied children of the Arians, who fasten together knotty  
 and crooked propositions<sup>h</sup> in order that by dint of these  
 they may raise doubts, and get hold of simple people, while  
 they themselves are in doubt about the faith. In like man-  
 ner also they have learned to say, “Who is He that was  
 born of Mary? is He God or man<sup>i</sup>? ” and then if any one  
 says, “Man,” he may be led to disbelieve in His Godhead,  
 and agree with those heretics who have disbelieved in it:  
 or, if he says, “God,” he will deny His Nativity in flesh,  
 and be led away with those heretics who deny it. And  
 then again they ask, “Who is He that suffered? is He God  
 or man? ” so that if one answers “God,” he may utter a  
 blasphemous word, like the impious Arians; and if he says

<sup>f</sup> Here, as in c. 19, the Apollinarians are rebuked for indulging in unwarranted speculations. Cf. c. Apoll. i. 13.

<sup>g</sup> As the Photinians, in effect: and more openly the Artemonites.

<sup>h</sup> See Orat. c. Arian. i. 22; compare Newman in Athan. Treatises ii. 23, ed. 2, and Arians, p. 29 ff.

<sup>i</sup> That is, the suggestion of a false antithesis may impel men in either of two wrong directions. Athanasius of course would have them answer, He is truly God and truly Man, c. 2, c. Apoll.

i. 16. S. Hilary says, “He knows nothing whatever of his own life who knows not Christ Jesus to be true Man even as He is true God,” de Trin. ix.

3. Proclus says emphatically that “of necessity He, the same, is both God and man . . . Christ is in very truth man, but He became such when before He had been simply God; for as He is God, not created, so is He, the same, also man not in mere semblance” (i. e. really God and really man.) Tom. ad Armenos, Mansi, v. 432.

“Man,” he may on the contrary be speaking according to Jewish sentiments. Therefore the Holy Scriptures affirm the Word to be ineffably God from the Father, and to have Himself become man from the Virgin in the last times: that neither “God” may be disbelieved, nor the birth in flesh be denied. But where there is the name of “flesh,” there is the orderly form of our whole constitution<sup>k</sup>, but without sin. And they connect the Passion with the name of man, and do not go further, as it is written in the Holy Scriptures: bnt conceiving the Godhead of the Word, they acknowledge its unchangeableness and ineffableness. Therefore the “Word” is spoken of as Divine<sup>l</sup>, but the “Man” is the subject of a genealogy; in order that the selfsame might naturally and truly appear in both aspects:<sup>m</sup> as “God,” in reference to the eternity of Godhead and to the Authorship of creation; as “Man,” in reference to His birth from a woman, and His increase in stature: “God,” in connection with His life-giving operations, and as mighty in wonderful works: “Man,” in connection with His feelings corresponding to our own, and His participation in our infirmities; “God the Word,” in the exhibition of His immortality and incorruption and unchangeableness: “Man,” as His being nailed to the Cross, and in the flowing of blood, and the burial of His body, and the descent into Hades, and the resurrection from the dead. Thus was Christ raised from the dead, and being God, He raises up the dead.

19. Foolish then are those who attribute the Passion to His Godhead, or who disbelieve His Incarnation, or who call the one “two,” or who attempt to make a precise description<sup>n</sup> of “His flesh,” and venture to say, “how much,” or “how,” beyond the Scriptures<sup>o</sup>. For by such notions have the minds of heretics lost their footing. Marcion lapsed through excess of blasphemy; Manichæus was perverted by an opinion about sin; Valentinus was led astray by a pretence of knowledge<sup>p</sup>; Paul of Samosata, and he

<sup>k</sup> See above, c. 1.

<sup>m</sup> C. Apollin. i. 10. Comp. Orat. c.

<sup>l</sup> θεολογεῖται. Comp. the extract from the “Little Labyrinth” in Euseb. v. 28; and so in Orat. c. Ari. ii. 71, “the Word is praised with the Father, and adored καὶ θεολογύμενος.”

<sup>n</sup> Ari. iii. 29, on the Scriptural account of Christ as twofold.

<sup>o</sup> Literally, measurement.

<sup>p</sup> C. 17.

<sup>q</sup> See Hooker, v. 60. 4.

C. APOLL. who was called Photinus, and their followers, fell away by  
11. disbelief in the Godhead; Arius blasphemed through madness<sup>q</sup>; and you, who employ the same sophisms, say what  
is not written in Scripture, and pervert the unstable. But  
Cf. Heb. it is enough to believe in what has been written, and what  
4. 15. 1 S. Pet. has taken place (as Paul says, *Like to us in all things,*  
4. 1. *without sin*, and Peter, *Since Christ then suffered for us in*  
*flesh, arm yourselves also with the same mind;*) and not  
push speculations further, and so reject the truth.

<sup>q</sup> On the “fanatical fury” of the Arians see Athan. Treat. ii. 377. ed. 2.

## NOTE

### ON THE "DE INCARNATIONE ET CONTRA ARIANOS" AND THE "SERMO MAJOR DE FIDE."

#### I.

To the first of these two treatises, Cardinal Newman refers with a saving clause, "if the work be genuine," (Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 296) as formerly in Athan. Treatises, i. 264, "if it be his." There is certainly reason for questioning the authorship. The Benedictine editors, who uphold its genuineness, date it after A.D. 365, when the Aomœans were assuming a bolder front; for it is avowedly directed against them and the Macedonians. But would S. Athanasius at this period have spoken of "three hypostases" in the Godhead? (De Inc. et c. Ari. 10.) He had done so about 20 years earlier, (In illud, Omnia, 6,) when, as comparatively a young theologian, he might use "hypostasis" in the sense familiar to his predecessor Alexander, (Theod. i. 4: see Newman, I. c.) But it would have been another thing to do so soon after that same phrase had been to some extent discouraged (though admitted to be orthodox after due explanation) in the "Tome," c. 6. Again, while Apollinarianism was gradually diffusing itself, Athanasius could hardly have written of our Lord's "flesh" precisely in the style of de Inc. et c. Ari. 3, "that His flesh might become God the Word," (contrast c. Apollin. i. 10) without a safeguard in the context against the idea of "fusion," or of the coessentiality of the flesh with the Word. The recognition of Him as "perfect man," in c. 8, may modify, but does not remove, this objection: for that phrase was accepted, disingenuously enough, by Apollinarians, (Epiph. Hær. 77. 23.) Thirdly; some important texts are explained otherwise than S. Athanasius usually explains them. True, he is fertile in exegetical alternatives: but he would hardly have interpreted S. John 5. 26, simply of "life" given to Christ's body (c. 2; contrast Orat. c. Ari. iii. 36); or ib. 14, 28 "as touching the Manhood" (c. 4; contrast Orat. c. Ari. i. 58.) and, still more, the LXX. Prov. 8. 22 of the Church as founded in Christ, (c. 6; contrast the well known interpretation given at such length in Orat. c. Ari. ii. 44 ff. referring

it to the formation of His human body.) Fourthly, we cannot but observe in his treatise a certain amount of inconsistency in the treatment of that Divine self-humiliation, or "impoverishment" (2 Cor. 8, 9,) of which, as the writer says, quite in Athanasian style, the Arians took a perverse advantage. Sometimes he shews a disposition to narrow overmuch what S. Cyril calls the "limits of the *κέρωσις*," as when he sees in the prayer, "Glorify Thou Me," (S. John 17, 5,) merely a request for the glorifying of believers, because "His shame was our glory," (e. 5,) and avoids the admission of any withdrawal of the Father's felt presence from our Lord's soul at one moment of His Crucifixion by saying that in S. Matt. 27, 47 He "spoke as our representative," (e. 2); language which seems to go beyond the line traced in Orat. c. Arian. iii. 56, 57, if it finds some parallel in Orat. iv. 6, 7. On the other hand, the realities of the Condescension are plainly recognized in such statements as, "The Eternal Wisdom increased in wisdom as Man," (e. 11) and "as Man He deprecated the sufferings," (e. 21) and still more when the dogmatic decision of the Sixth Oecumenical Council is verbally anticipated by the assertion of "two Wills, human and Divine," in the Incarnate (e. 21.) It may be thought that S. Athanasius, in presence of Apollinarianism, would have held the balance with a steadier hand. Yet too much stress should not be laid on this amount of difference; and it must be added that the interpretation of Phil. 2, 9, given in e. 2, taken together with e. 11, agrees with that in Orat. Ari. ii. 41; as that of Acts 2, 36 in e. 21 agrees with that in Orat. ii. 12; and the brief gloss on S. Mark 13, 32, "He speaks humanly," in e. 7, is a condensation of the exposition given in Orat. iii. 42 ff. There is also much that is Athanasian in tone, as the contrast between our Lord's Sonship by nature and ours by grace, in e. 8; and Athanasius might well have written such sentences as "His death is our immortality, and His tear our joy, and His burial our resurrection, and His descent our ascent," (e. 5,) or "whosoever carry the Spirit of God carry light, and those who carry light are clothed with Christ, and those who are clothed with Christ are clothed with the Father," (e. 15,) or the pregnant dictum as to what the "formulary of reunion" (Cyril, Ep. ad Joan.) calls the "lowly" texts, that "Christian truth in all its exactness is found among commonplace sayings and deeds," (e. 6.)

The writer's grateful acknowledgements are due to Cardinal Newman, who had the goodness to make a communication to him on the subject, and specified among other points, (such as the "new interpretations" of two important texts,) the repeated use of the word *διπλόχυτος*, the stress laid on "the idea of mystery" in *διπλότος*,

ἀφράστως, ἀκαταλήπτως, (c. 8) and “the explicit mention of ‘two wills,’—startling, since Athan.’s way is less dogmatic,”—as contributing to produce an impression “against the genuineness of the treatise.”

On the whole it seems most probable that this book was put together by an admirer and imitator of S. Athanasius,—a disciple, so to speak, of his school, who might venture to differ from him on some points of exegesis or terminology, but would use, perhaps to a considerable extent, memoranda of his teaching.

## II.

“The *Sermo Major de Fide,*” which Theodoret quotes in his three Dialogues as a work of S. Athanasius, was discovered in a nearly complete form, in a MS. of the tenth century, by Montfaucon: another fragment was published by Card. Mai in his *Nova Bibliotheca*. The beginning and the end are lost.

The treatise is really a letter (c. 24) and as far as we can judge, was directed against the Arians, who “said that the Word was a creature” (c. 21) and detracted from His Divinity (c. 28:) while the fragment attacks them for “attributing to Him flesh bereft of a rational soul.” The first chapter, however, seems to allude to one of the Apollinarian opinions. “The Word became flesh, not as if resolved into flesh.” The line of argument is Athanasian enough—to distinguish between the Scriptural expressions which relate to the Divinity and to the Humanity of Christ. The peculiarity lies in the reiteration of a certain number of phrases as descriptive of that Humanity. “The Man of the Lord,” ἀνθρωπὸς Κυριακός, occurs nine times, in c. 4, 19, 21, 26, 28, 31, 38; and once in another form, τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνθρωπον, c. 22. We have also “the man understood in regard to the Saviour,” δικαὶον τὸν Σωτῆρα νοούμενος ἀνθρωπός, four times, c. 18, 21, 25, 28: “the man according to the Saviour,” c. 21, 22: “the man of the Saviour,” c. 24, 30: “the man according to the flesh,” c. 19: “the man whom He bore,” c. 13, 16, 28, 29, 32, 37: (the phrase was used by Eustathius, Theod. Dial. 2.) “the man assumed,” c. 20, and “the Word assumed the man,” c. 31. (By “the Saviour” is meant the Word, in a certain degree of antithesis to Jesus: whereas in *Orat.* c. Ari. iii. 23 “the Saviour” is synonymous with “the Son of man.”) The “Man” is described as Jesus Christ, the second Adam, the Mediator, c. 25, 26, and is said to have gone willingly to death, being strengthened by the indwelling Word, c. 4. Then again this word “Man” seems in some places to mean “body,” as c. 2, 13, 19, 24, 37; we find “the body which grew” called a creature in c. 21, as is

"the man whom He bore" in c. 16, 26; "the Son of Man" is explained by "the Lord's body" in c. 17, 19: the words "Sit on My right hand," are quoted as spoken to "the man" and to "the body," c. 19, 29: the LXX, Prov. 8, 22 is similarly treated in c. 14, and 21. In one passage "the flesh" is described as "the Lord's humanity," c. 3. It is not easy to believe that S. Athanasius, writing after the rise of Apollinarianism, or even indeed before it, could be responsible for such a jumble of phrases. It is not merely a case of the known use of *ἀνθρωπός* where we should say "manhood," as we find it in c. Apollin. ii. 15: it is not merely an occasional use of the expression, "the Man of the Lord," which occurs twice in the Athanasian "Expositio Fidei," (probably the "book of Athanasius" referred to as containing it, Jerome c. Ruf. ii. 20) and in Didymus de Spir. Saneto 51, and was used by Epiphanius, Ancorat. 95, to describe Christ's flesh, while S. Augustine, when expressing a wish that he himself had never used the Latin equivalent, "Homo Dominicus," (which apparently had been used by Pope Damasus, Mansi, iii. 426) admitted that something might be said in its favour. (Retraet. i. 19, 8,) even as S. Thomas Aquinas allowed that "Homo" might be used for the human nature of the Lord, not for a human person, Sum. iii. 16, 3. What strikes us is the iteration of the phrase, combined with other phrases of a like sort, the result of which might be simply confusing to some minds, while to others they might easily suggest that very error against which S. Athanasius contends so earnestly in his later treatises,—the notion that "the Word dwelt in a man as formerly in the prophets," see Orat. c. Ari. iii. 30, and compare the Tome, 7; Ep. Epict. 11, &c. Surely, if he had at this time used the phrase, "Man of the Lord," which Apollinarians adopted in their own sense (S. Greg. Naz. Ep. 101) and which might more naturally prepare the way for Nestorianism, he would have guarded it carefully against abuse, just as in Orat. iv. 35 he guards the single word "Man" by insisting that the "hypostasis" of the Word is inseparable from "the Man" born of Mary, and that our Lord does not say in S. Luke 24, 39, "as ye see this Man of mine have." The writer of the "Sermo Major" does not thus clearly affirm the personal oneness of the Incarnate: he is content to use "man" interchangeably with "body," or to say that "the Word was hidden in Jesus," c. 32. Moreover he regards the Mediation as pertaining to this "Man," c. 26, whereas the Athanasian doctrine is that mankind cannot be brought near to God save by one who is both human and Divine, Orat. c. Ari. ii. 67. He interprets S. Mark 13, 32 by saying that the Father gave all knowledge to "the Son," and therefore it was "Jesus" who "knew not of the day," c. 33;

whereas in *Orat. c. Ari. iii. 43* it is plainly taught that it was the Son who as the Word knew all things, but “as man knew not the hour of the end.” It seems, moreover, incredible that he who in *Ep. Epict. 5* and *Orat. c. Ari. i. 35* cites *Heb. 13. 8*, in connection with *Mal. 3. 6*, as a proof of the Word’s Divine immutability, would explain it as in *Serm. Maj. 21*, of “the man understood in regard to the Saviour” as being “the same that was once an infant, then increased in age and favour, and began to be about thirty years of age.” (Nestorius may have read this passage, see *Cyr. adv. Nest. iii. 2.*) The interpretation of *S. John 14. 28* as relating to the Manhood, which has already been noticed as occurring in *De Inc. et Ari.*, occurs three in the “*Sermo*,” c. 14, 34, 39. There are passages in the “*Sermo*” which are highly Athanasian in tone, as c. 20, 22, 24: there are illustrations which remind one of Athanasius’ early writings: (e. g. c. 24, 27, 35) portions of the “*De Incarnatione Verbi*,” 8, 9, 17, 20, 41, are actually embodied, with some verbal alterations, in *Serm. 5, 6, 7, 11, 12*. But it seems evident that another mind has been at work, selecting materials and developing ideas in a way of its own. It seems not improbable that the reason why the “*Sermo*,” in Montfaucon’s words, “diu in tenebris latebat,” was not so much the “carelessness of copyists” as the advantage which had been taken of some passages by advocates of the abhorred Nestorian heresy.

## APPENDIX.

### ON S. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA'S INTERPRETATIONS OF HIS ANATHEMAS, AND ON THE DIALOGUES OF THEODORET.

The chief object of S. Athanasius, as a Doctor of the Church, was to maintain the truth embodied in the word Homioousion,—the truth, as he himself loved to express it, that the Only-begotten Son of God is Son by nature and in reality. But, as work grows out of work, this advocacy of the Nicene watchword led on to the defence of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit in the four Epistles to Serapion, and again to a treatment of the doctrine of the Incarnation properly so called in the Third Discourse against the Arians, and in most of the tracts included in this volume. In reading the latter, our attention has repeatedly been called to that large and luminous insight, that majestic comprehensiveness, that stedfast grasp of the revealed verity as a whole, which made the genuine teaching of Athanasius on this subject an authority and a support in those two momentous controversies<sup>a</sup> respecting the Person of our Incarnate Saviour which troubled the peace, but matured and consolidated the thought, of the Church in the fifth age. Nor can we wonder if under the shelter of such a name, some statements which in all likelihood were wrongly ascribed to him acquired a factitious importance, and that one of them, at least, eventually when quoted in good faith as his<sup>b</sup>, increased the complications attendant on the still partially unsettled condition of doctrinal terminology.

It is proposed to illustrate the character and range of S. Athanasius' theological influence on the mind of Greek-speaking Christendom in the Nestorian and Eutychian period by some detailed references to the best-weighed statements of two eminent men who represented the two aspects of ecclesiastical Christology. One of them occupied the second see in Christendom, which had acquired a new dignity as the throne of Athanasius. He was a voluminous commentator on Scripture: his criticisms have preserved to us a large part, at least, of Julian's treatise against Christianity<sup>c</sup>: and what is more to our present purpose, he was, in Cardinal Newman's

<sup>a</sup> See note in Athan. Treatises, Lib. *φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*.  
Fath, i. 244.

<sup>b</sup> See below as to the phrase, *μία θεός*, p. 232.

<sup>c</sup> See Rendall, The Emperor Ju-

words, “a clear-headed constructive theologian<sup>d</sup>,” with a keen perception of issues at stake, a thorough devotion to an “august mystery<sup>e</sup>,” a high courage, an indomitable perseverance, but also a vehement and masterful temper to which,—not merely, though mainly, in his earlier years,—the lordly powers of the Egyptian patriarchate<sup>f</sup> presented a serious temptation. The other was, as a prelate, among the rank and file of the hierarchy, doing good work, secular as well as spiritual, in the far north of Syria, for an out-of-the-way city which he could not pretend to like<sup>g</sup>, and a diocese in which old-world heresies were the popular religion of peasants, and efforts to root them out, though in the long run triumphant, were made at the cost of bodily peril and harm<sup>h</sup>. And the bishop who had such work to go through was at the same time “facile princeps” among his brethren for varied learning and persuasive church oratory, for ability of a richly versatile type, and for a warmth of heart which, if it made him think too well of some old friends, drew out men’s affection together with their admiration<sup>i</sup>, gave him special aptitudes for comforting the sorrow-stricken<sup>k</sup>, fills his extant letters with a living human interest, and enables us to feel towards him as we can hardly feel towards any of his contemporaries in East and West, always excepting that most noble and loveable Saint who fell asleep in beleaguered Hippo when the Nestorian strife was less than two years old. Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrrhus came somewhat roughly into collision with each other in the progress of that strife: each of them made some mistakes, each for a time deemed the other heretical: and although at last they were substantially in agreement, each looked mainly at his own side of the shield. The mystery of the Incarnation has two aspects, one relating to Christ’s single Personality, the other to the distinctness of His Manhood from his Godhead. Cyril emphasized the former, while really acknowledging the latter: Theodoret reversed the process. Cyril specially dreaded a “sever-

<sup>d</sup> Newman, Historical Sketches, iii. 345.

<sup>e</sup> He calls the Incarnation  $\tauὸ$   $\sigmaεπτὴν$   $\etaμᾶν$   $\muνστῆριον$ , Quod Deus sit Christus, (Pusey, p. 357.)

<sup>f</sup> Newman, Historical Sketches, iii. 339. It is especially in regard to the presents sent by Cyril in 433 to Court personages in order to enlist their influence that Tillemont says, “S. Cyrille est saint, mais on ne peut pas dire que toutes ses actions soient saintes;” adding, in words of memorable significance, “les plus saints ont beaucoup à craindre la tentation qui

nous porte à regarder comme légitime ce qui semble nous pouvoir faire réussir dans les entreprises saintes . . . Il faut combattre pour Dieu selon les loix de Dieu, si l’on veut qu’ il nous couronne.” xiv. 541.

<sup>g</sup> Theodoret, Ep. 32, 24, 81, 138. Compare Synodicon, c. 71, in Mansi v. 847.

<sup>h</sup> Ep. 81, 113.

<sup>i</sup> See Historical Sketches, iii. 330. Compare Theod. Ep. 1, 2, 9, 24, 33, 48, 49, 59, 62, 66, 123.

<sup>k</sup> Theod. Ep. 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 27, &c.

ance," Theodoret a "confusion." Cyril was on the watch against the rationalising temper which would explain away the Incarnation into an association such as might exist between the Divine Word and a preeminent saint, and substantially such as had been imagined by some professing Churchmen in the latter years of S. Athanasius<sup>1</sup>. Theodoret believed the chief peril to lie in the direction of that peculiar mysticism which, by its crude method of asserting the Redeemer's oneness, had cut the bonds which linked Him to our humanity: and he was therefore disposed to put the best construction on that whole line of speculation which Theodore bishop of Mopsuestia, the father of Nestorianism, and already the favourite "commentator" in the East<sup>m</sup>, had struck out as against the Apollinarianism which he abhorred. Yet Cyril had a true belief in our Lord's Manhood, and Theodoret was not less sound as to His Personal Divinity. Thus each of the two men did that sort of work for which his antecedents and habits of thought had fitted him, and thereby gave in his appropriate contribution to the ultimate settlement of the twofold question raised. Let us look first to S. Cyril.

The doctrine which, in the language of divines, suggested originally by Cyril himself, is called that of the "Hypostatic" or Personal "Union," can be stated quite simply, and brought home to the consciousness of ordinary Christians, to whom "dogmatic technicalities" are un congenial or unknown. In fact, they repeatedly, or even habitually, state it with their own lips. For instance, when they join in what may be called our national Christmas hymn, and lift up their hearts in the exulting stanza,

"Christ, by highest heaven adored,  
Christ, the Everlasting Lord,  
Late in time behold Him come,  
Offspring of a Virgin's womb,"

Charles Wesley is teaching them to say just what S. Cyril would have had them say, if they had lived in his time, and attended his

<sup>1</sup> Thus we find him literally reproducing S. Athanasius' words, doubtless with an allusion to Nestorianism. "The Word of God became Man; He did not come into a man, as in the case of the prophets." Thesaurus, p. 232. Cp. Ep. Epict. 2.

<sup>m</sup> In 438 Cyril writes that in the Syrian churches the people cried out, "Success to the faith of Theodore; we believe as he did." Epist. p. 197. See p. 193 for a synodical letter of John of Antioch, admitting that Theodore used some ambiguous expressions, but pleading that these had

parallels in the works of "glorious fathers." For Theodore see a remarkable article in Church Quarterly Review for October, 1875: but compare a sterner view of him in Christ, Remembr. July, 1851. Dorner, in his "Person of Christ," considers that Theodore's Christology was determined by his wish to provide for a "free moral development" in the Saviour's manhood: for which reason he supposed a specifically close alliance between the Divine Word and Jesus as a human person. This might, he said, be called a union, but only as marriage

services in the “Cæsareum” of Alexandria. They are saying in verse,—and verse has no privilege in presence of the Third Commandment,—what he meant by insisting on Theotocos as an accurate title for the Mother of the Emmanuel. But moreover, in every act of worship addressed to Jesus Christ, the doctrine is logically presupposed. For to adore Him implies that He is God; that He is not a man who beyond all other men has been penetrated by a Divine spirit, or realised a Divine fellowship, or represented the Divine idea of humanity, but simply and literally that He is Himself God, the Eternal Son and Word, who has become Man; so that He who was born of Mary, was crucified, rose again, ascended into heaven, is the same “He” who in the beginning was with God and was God; and it is the Second Person of the Holy Trinity who has actually entered into the sphere of a human life, taken into union with His very self a human soul and human body, and thus far become in all things like unto us, sin only excepted. The “Ego,” so to speak, of Jesus is that which could say, “Before Abraham was, I am.” Or, to put it otherwise, Scripture and the original Christian faith teach that “Jesus Christ is God.” Now here the predicate can not, with due regard to the whole current of Scriptural theology, be taken in a lax sense for an image or delegate of God, or one who was preeminently “godlike” in character. And the copula cannot be taken to mean “represents,” “is the chief agent of,” “is in closest sympathy with,” &c.; for such glosses fall short of the requirements of Scriptural Christology as a whole. Both words, then, must be taken simply. Therefore Jesus Christ is Himself God, that same Divine Son and Word who was from eternity in the bosom of the Father; He is that Son as manifested in flesh, as having taken on Himself a true humanity. This is the doctrine of the “Hypostatic Union;” this is what, in the fifth century, was condensed into the phrase “One Christ.” We may vary the terms in which we state it: we may present it to the devout imagination under those stirring and touching antitheses by which devout minds in various ages have striven to set forth the stupendousness of the Divine con-

is a union; and John 1. 14 was not to be taken “too strictly.” On this view, Jesus, being guided from the very dawn of life by the indwelling Word, easily advanced to higher and yet higher moral attainments, &c. But in order to make His “development” entirely analogous to that of men, Theodore would have had to take a further step, and admit that it was in fact possible, during the pro-

cess, that He should have fallen under temptation. For if this was not possible, then neither was it possible to establish that parity for which Theodore had sacrificed so much of the faith. Extracts from Theodore’s writings are preserved in the acts of the Fifth General Council, and in Leontius c. Nest. et Eutych. lib. 3. Diodore of Tarsus held similar views, see Cyril, Epistles, p. 135.

descension<sup>u</sup>; we may try to think out some of what Mozley calls its “inexhaustible logical contents,” to follow out the “explanatory developments<sup>v</sup>” which have elicited them in detail: we may transcribe and repeat what Hooker<sup>w</sup> and Pearson<sup>x</sup> have written in comment on the formularies of the Councils, or on the texts which exemplify “the interchange of properties;” we may say, in words still dear to many, “God became Man, yet still was God, having His Manhood as an adjunct, perfect in its kind, but dependent upon His Godhead . . . He was Man because He had our human nature wholly and perfectly; but though Man, He was not, strictly speaking, in the English sense of the word, *a* man: not . . . one out of a number; His Person is not human like ours, but Divine . . . All that is necessary to constitute a perfect manhood is attached to His eternal Person absolutely and entirely, belonging to Him as really and fully as His justice, truth, or power:” or in the words of another<sup>y</sup>, “The Person of the Son of Mary is divine and eternal: it is none other than the Person of the Word . . . Christ’s Manhood is not of itself an individual being; it is not a seat and centre of personality; it has no conceivable existence apart from the act whereby the Eternal Word, in becoming incarnate, called it into being and made it His own:” or with a German Protestant writer, “There was not a created human nature in the sense of concrete subsistence (a man); for the Son of God was not united to a son of man, but became Man, assumed the properties of the human form of existence<sup>z</sup>. We may point out how this personal identity of God and Man in the Christ, whereby the “Ego” in the Man of Sorrows was absolutely one with that of Him who preexisted in the form of God, is a necessity of His character as a true Mediator between God and man, who could “lay His hand upon both” in right of a twofold coessentiality: yet, after all, we feel that our best words are inadequate; they add nothing to, they can but “in part” indicate, the substantial idea of the Incarnation, the truth that God became Man<sup>u</sup>, that “our Lord Jesus

<sup>u</sup> Some have been referred to above, p. 53. See also Dr. Pusey’s Sermons from Advent to Whitsuntide, p. 62.

<sup>v</sup> Mozley on Theory of Development, p. 148.

<sup>w</sup> Hooker, E. P. v. c. 52.

<sup>x</sup> Pearson on Creed, (art. 4) vol. i. p. 321, ed. Burton.

<sup>y</sup> Newman, Paroch. Sermons, vi. 61, 62, 65. Compare ib. ii. 32, “He came, selecting and setting apart for Himself the elements of body and soul, then uniting them to Himself from their first origin of existence,” &c.

<sup>z</sup> Liddon, Bamp. Lect. p. 259.

Compare Wilberforce on the Incarnation, p. 132, that our Lord’s personality must be one, and that it must be resident in His Godhead, even as He Himself said, “Before Abraham was, I am.”

<sup>z</sup> Ebrard, quoted by Oosterzee, Image of Christ, p. 151.

<sup>u</sup> Mozley on Theory of Development, p. 149. See also his Essays, ii. 118, where the manifestation of God through the imagery of human character in the Old Testament is viewed as a preparation for, and as “substantiated” by, “that deeper

Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man," that in Him, "God and Man is one Christ." To this idea, held fast as Divinely revealed, S. Cyril's mind was thoroughly devoted<sup>x</sup>. And he saw it confronted by another idea, set forth in the sermons of Nestorius, archbishop of Constantinople. Nestorianism, as Cyril knew it, came to this: that Jesus Christ was a man existing individually like other men, with a distinct human personality<sup>y</sup>, but taken into exceptional closeness of relationship to the Eternal Son, who dwelt in him as in a temple<sup>z</sup>, used him as an instrument<sup>a</sup>, wore him as a vesture<sup>b</sup>, was borne by him<sup>c</sup>, admitted him to a share in His own titles, authority, and dignity<sup>d</sup>, and in *this* sense to a oneness with Him, which Nes-

mystery" whereby "God the Son . . . reveals his character, not through a metaphorical but through an actual manhood. The human medium is now a mysterious reality instead of a symbolical expression; and humanity has an absolute basis in theology which it had not before."

<sup>x</sup> Dorner, while considering that Cyril was to blame for not sympathising with the Antiochene school in its desire to define more clearly the relations of Divinity and Humanity in the Christ, and that he did not bring out the "ethical" aspect of the Incarnation, admits that he had "a far clearer perception of the *religious* importance" of the question than had the Antiochenes, and was "anxious that God's marvellous love manifested in the Incarnation should not suffer the least diminution of its glory," ii. 1. 60, 73.

<sup>y</sup> Ἰδικῶς, Cyr. Ep. ad Nest. 2; Expl. 2, 3, 4; adv. Orient. 8, 9, 11; adv. Theod. 4; ἴδιη, Expl. 12; adv. Orient. 3, 11; ἀνὰ μέρος, Ep. ad Nest. 3; Expl. 2, 3, 12; adv. Orient. 8; adv. Theod. 4; Ep. 1 ad Acac. Melit. ἀνὰ μόνας, adv. Orient. 3, 8; Ep. 1 ad Succensum (Epist. p. 136;) κατὰ μόνας ὡς ἀνθρώπον καὶ ἐπερον ὄντα ὑδν, adv. Orient. 3, so Quod unus sit Christus, Pusey, p. 372, 373, &c. Compare Nestorius' words, Mansi, iv. 1201, and his Sermons in Marius Mercator; while disclaiming the idea of two Sons, he says, "The Word of God is called Christ because He has a continuous connection with the Christ." "Let us reverence that man who by the Divine connection is adored together with God." And ap. Cyr. adv. Nest. iii. 3, that He who was yesterday and today, not He who said, "Be-

fore Abraham was, I am," was Abraham's seed, (whereupon Cyril says, "You are dividing again, and very plainly.") Much of his language might have been taken in a sound sense; but his real meaning was illustrated by other passages, by his association with Theodore, (Epist. p. 197,) and by his saying, "I will never call a child of 2 or 3 months old God," Mansi, iv. 1881.

<sup>z</sup> Nestorius, serm. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Nest. serm. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Nest. serm. 2, 4.

<sup>c</sup> Cyr. adv. Nest. i. 1. comp. Anath. 5. &c. See Dr. Pusey's Two Sermons on Faith, p. 62. In another sense Nestorius used to say that the Word "bore" the Man Jesus as a garment; Διὰ τὸν φοροῦντα τὸν φορούμενον σέβω, quoted in adv. Nest. i. 11. (Pusey, p. 127.)

<sup>d</sup> See Nestorius in Cyril adv. Nest. ii. 5. iii. 2. ap. Mercat. And the creed called Theodore's, condemned by Council of Ephesus, described the Man Jesus as partner in the honours of the Word, Mansi, iv. 1349; see Cyril, Quod unus sit Christus, (Pusey, p. 354); and Ep. ad Nest. 2. 5, (Pusey, p. 22,) "Not that a man is simply connected as by oneness of dignity or authority with God." So Expl. 2, 5; adv. Orient. 3. So de Recta Fide ad Aread. e. 8, "Not holding His dignity ἐν χάριτος μέρει καὶ ἐπακτύ." The Fifth Ecumenical Council condemns those who say that the union was by grace, operation, equality of honour, authority . . . power, good will, or identity of names; and affirms it to be a union by way of combination (*σύνθεσιν*) or hypostasis, so that both confusion and division are excluded, Anath. 4. So Damascene

torius usually expressed by the term *συνάφεια*, connection or combination<sup>e</sup>. Thus, however Nestorius might disclaim the idea of two Sons<sup>f</sup>, or speak with profound reverence of Jesus, or admit the term Theotocos in a sense<sup>g</sup>, or seem to be only “distinguishing the natures,” still in his view there stretched between the Son of God and the Son of Mary a gap not to be bridged over. It could not be said of Jesus that in him the “self” was Divine; but only that he was the human agent of redemption, the human medium of a Christian Theophany. The connection between Him and the Eternal Son was thus, as Cyril called it, *σχέσις*<sup>h</sup>, that is, non-essential or accidental, and was therefore “eiusdem generis” with that which linked saints and prophets<sup>i</sup>, (not to say all baptized Christians<sup>k</sup>,) to Him who in so many ways draws His servants into fellowship with Himself. Christ, in short, was but the supreme instance of moral intimacy between holy men and God. As Arian magniloquence in praise of “the Son<sup>l</sup>” could not veil the fact that He was regarded as, so to speak, a loftier archangel, so in this case, to adorn the “associated” Christ with names belonging of right to the true Son of God (for Nestorius was quite free from Arian views of the Sonship, as from Photinian views of the Word) could not avert the inference, “Christ, then, with you, is the chief of saints, and nothing more.” Another result followed, which seemed like an echo of the Arian controversy. Arians

excludes an union of character, dignity, unanimity, joint honour, joint name, &c. de Fid. Orth. iii. 3: and Aquinas, an union by indwelling, affection, operation, dignity, interchange of titles, Sum. 3. 2. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Nestorius acknowledged a “complete abiding *συνάφεια*,” adv. Nest. ii. 7. See Ep. ad Nest. 3. 5, “We reject the term *συνάφεια* as inadequate;” and Explan. 2, 3, 5, 11. In Quod unus sit Christus, (Pusey, p. 360,) Cyril says that this “term might describe the relations of pupil to teacher, of agent to principal.” On the Stoies’ distinction between *ένωσις*, as applying to the constituents, e. g. of a *ζῷον*, and *συνάφεια* as applying, e. g. to chains or houses, see Zeller’s Stoies &c, transl. Reichel, p. 101.

<sup>f</sup> Cyril quotes an ingenious attempt of Nestorius to charge him with holding “two Sons,” meaning, two natures of the Son, adv. Nest. i. 3. He said also, “We do not hold two Sons; there is not with us *ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος*,” ib. ii. 5. So in Serm. 4, (Dee., 130.)

<sup>g</sup> In his first sermon he spoke of Theotocos as heathenish; later, re-

membering probably how Athanasius as well as others had used it, he said he would agree to use it if Anthropotocos might be used too.

<sup>h</sup> E.g. Ep. ad Nest. 3. 5; adv. Nest. i. 1, ii. 1; adv. Theod. 1, 3. The Stoies called non-essential qualities *σχέσεις*, Zeller’s Stoies, &c. p. 100.

<sup>i</sup> Comp. Ep. ad Nest. 3. 4; Expl. 5; adv. Orient. 9, adv. Theod. 1. 5. In Quod unus sit Christus, (Pusey, p. 360,) Cyril says that “*έπερός τις* might have *συνάφεια* with God, as being linked to Him through virtue and sanctification.” So Marius Mercator (ed. Bahuz, p. 145) that Nestorius, when he did speak of “union,” used it in the sense in which Christians are as one. Theodore had endeavoured to make out a difference between the Divine indwelling in Jesus and that in other holy men. “The whole being” of Jesus was united (in that sense) to God (Galland, xii. 692.) But this was clearly a mere difference of degree.

<sup>k</sup> Adv. Nest. ii. 8. Schol. 18.

<sup>l</sup> See Newman’s Arians, p. 246. Ath. Treat. ii. 36, ed. 2.

had been taxed with idolatry on their own principles; for they worshipped the Son, while regarding Him as a creature<sup>m</sup>. Nestorians spoke of worshipping the Son of Mary along with, or on account of, the Son of God<sup>n</sup>, on the ground of a partition of dignity: and Cyril had to remind them that association could not constitute adorableness, and that the God of Christians was the same who of old had said, “I will not give My glory to another<sup>o</sup>.”

The first stage of the controversy extended from the end of 328 to the August of 330. Cyril wrote much during this period,—a letter “to the Monks,” a first letter to Nestorius, perhaps his notes or “Scholia” on the Incarnation,—three treatises addressed to Theodosius II. and to the princesses of the imperial house, Arcadia, Marina, Pulcheria and Eudocia; above all, that second letter to Nestorius which received such especial and emphatic acceptance from (Ecumenical Councils<sup>p</sup>. He was in correspondence with Celestine, bishop of Rome, to whom, about April in 430, he put the momentous question whether one who was teaching downright heresy from the chair of Constantinople could be retained in the communion of bishops who held the right faith. Some months elapsed before Celestine could hold a synod; at last, on Aug. 10 or 11, he laid the evidence before his neighbour prelates, and Nestorius was pronounced to have taught heresy. Celestine forthwith wrote to Cyril<sup>q</sup>, directing him to “join the authority of the Roman See to his own,” and to signify to Nestorius that “unless a written retraction were executed within ten days, giving assurance of his acceptance of the faith “as to ‘Christ our God’ which was held by the churches of Rome “and Alexandria, he would be excluded from the communion of “those churches, and ‘provision’ would be made by them for the “church of Constantinople,” i. e. by the appointment of an orthodox

<sup>m</sup> Ad Adelph. 3. Basil, Ep. 243.

<sup>n</sup> See adv. Nest. ii. 10, μᾶλλον δὲ συμπροσκυνεῖς, ep. Anath. 8. Ep. ad Nest. 2, &c.

<sup>o</sup> See Cyril, *Quod unus sit Christus*, (Pusey, p. 358, 363, 410.) Comp. adv. Nest. ii. 13, “How can you pretend to honour with the same worship τὰ ὄντως ἀλλήλοις ἀνισοφυῆ, and which are separated in their very essence by a difference which admits of no comparison?” See Dorner, *Person of Christ*, ii. 1. 59, 27., representing Cyril’s argument, “A God somewhat resembling God would be Θεὸς ψευδώνυμος.” Nestorius showed his laxity of thought on this supreme point by interpreting Rom. 9. 5 thus, “He first acknowledges the man, and then

on account of the ‘connection’ with God calls that which was seen Divine.” So that “God blessed for ever” was to be a title assigned to the Man Jesus because God specially dwelt in Him. And he proceeded to quote “I have made thee a god to Pharaoh,” as if Christ’s relation to God was but different in degree from that of Moses. Mansi, iv. 1200, Cyril adv. Nest. ii. 3.

<sup>p</sup> The letter beginning Καταφλυαροῦσι, “obloquuntur,” written early in 430, (Pusey, p. 2.) After it was read in the Council of Ephesus, bishop after bishop, in varying terms, expressed his agreement with it, Mansi, iv. 1139—1169.

<sup>q</sup> Mansi, iv. 1018. Cf. Christ. Rememb. April 1855, p. 425.

bishop. Had Cyril been as violent and imperious as he is often represented, he would not have deferred by a single day the carrying out of those instructions: whereas he waited all through September and October until he could assemble his suffragans—usually reckoned as nearly a hundred in number,—and then he wrote a third letter to Nestorius<sup>t</sup>. This Synodical document, which begins by a reference to the “express words of our Saviour,” “He that loveth father or mother more than Me, is not worthy of Me,” peremptorily called on Nestorius, who was still addressed as a “most pious and devout fellow-minister,” to “give up his perverse doctrines, and adopt in place of them the right faith,”—and not merely to declare his adhesion to the Nicene Creed<sup>s</sup>, but expressly to anathematize his own “profane dogmas” according to a series of articles subjoined to the letter, but introduced by a long and elaborate exposition of doctrine, in which, as in the “second letter” of the preceding year<sup>t</sup>, care was taken to brand as heterodox those very positions of the Apollinarian school against which Nestorius professed to be contending,—e. g. that the flesh of Christ had been formed out of the Godhead, that the Godhead was in this respect possible, that Christ had not a ra-

<sup>t</sup> See it in Pusey's edition, p. 13; Mansi, iv. 1067. It was read at Ephesus, but no acclamations are recorded, ib. 1139; but the Council in its “memorial to the Emperor” says that it has compared “Cyril's epistles about the faith” with the Nicene Creed, and found them to be in accordance with it, ib. 1237. In the letter to Celestine the phrase is not ἐπιστολὰς (which, however, *might* mean only one letter) but γράμματα, ib. 1332. The “Eastern” party in their second petition to Theodosius say that Cyril's party (the Council) confirmed in writing the heretical “articles” (of Cyril), ib. 103. At the end of the first session of Chalcedon the imperial commissioners announced that their master adhered to Cyril's “two canonical letters, those which were confirmed in the first Council of Ephesus,” Mansi, vi. 937. But in the second session, the letters of Cyril which the archdeacon of Constantinople read, and the Council heard with acclamations, were the second letter to Nestorius and the epistle to John of Antioch or letter of reunion, written in the spring of 433, ib. vi. 960. Thus the third epistle to Nestorius, with the appended “articles,” was significantly passed over. But at the end of the session Atticus

of Nicopolis requested that it might be brought forward, i. e. in order that Leo's Tome might be compared with it also. In the fourth session the Tome was solemnly accepted, three bishops saying, *inter alia*, that it was in harmony with the “epistles” of Cyril; but as one of these was Theodoret, the reference is clearly to the second epistle and the epistle to John, Mansi, vii. 20. Several others speak of Cyril's “epistle,” i. e. the second to Nestorius. It was therefore a mistake as to fact when the Fifth General Council, in 550, asserted that the Council of Chalcedon had accepted “Cyril's synodical epistles, to one of which the 12 articles were appended,” Mansi, ix. 341. See Neale, Hist. Alex. i. 252.

<sup>s</sup> That is, the Creed as framed at Nicaea, not as afterwards revised. Cyril did not recognise the Council of Constantinople (A. D. 381.)

<sup>t</sup> “Not as if God the Word in His own nature endured beatings or piercings, &c.” “Not that, as far as His own nature was concerned, He experienced death, for it were insane to think thus; but that . . . it was *His* flesh that tasted death.” Comp. Athan. Ep. Epict. 6: c. Apollin. i. II, 18.

tional soul, that, in short, He was not in a true sense Man<sup>u</sup>. Then followed the memorable Articles, or Anathematisms, twelve in number. To propose to a person suspected of heresy a test composed of anathemas against the opinions which he was believed to entertain and was summoned to renounce, will probably not appear to us the best method of winning him over. But Tillemont holds that some of the anathematisms in the formulary sent by Damasus to Paulinus were intended as a test for Vitalis<sup>x</sup>. And in the wording of his "Articles," Cyril had not only adopted the stringent and, to many minds, provocative form of "anathematism," but had laid exclusive stress on that aspect of the doctrine of the Incarnation in regard to which Nestorius was in error. He had a good right to presume that the Articles would be read in close connection with the letter<sup>y</sup>, in which, as has been said, the other aspect of the mystery was so recognised as to keep the balance tolerably straight. Unfortunately, the Articles were taken by themselves, and read as if they expressed the whole of Cyril's belief on the subject. The result was nothing short of a calamity. An outcry against "Cyril's Apollinarianism" was raised in the very quarter where it was so important to win substantial assent. John, archbishop of Antioch, who was personally friendly to Nestorius, had so far acquiesced in Celestine's notification of the "ultimatum," as to write to the archbishop of Constantinople, with the express assent of Theodoret and five other bishops of his patriarchate, a letter which Tillemont describes as "très belle, très bien faite, et très digne de la réputation qu' avait ce prélat<sup>z</sup>," and in which he exhorted Nestorius

<sup>u</sup> Ep. ad Nest. 3. 3, 4.<sup>x</sup> Theodoret, v. 11: Tillemont, vii. 619. The 6th of these anathematisms anticipates and summarises the Cyrillicine series, "We anathematise those who affirm that there are two Sons," &c. The 14th is the original of Cyril's 12th.<sup>y</sup> The Articles, all but one, are founded on passages in the letter; but the order of the points taken is different. That in the letter is as follows—

1. Hypostatic union, i.e. one Christ. (Art. 2.)
2. Christ not a God-bearing man. (Art. 5.)
3. "Connection" an inadequate idea. (Art. 3.)
4. The Word not "Lord" of Christ as if of a distinct person. (Art. 6.)
5. "One adoration." (Art. 8.)
6. He suffered in flesh which was His own. (Art. 12.)

<sup>z</sup> 7. That flesh received by us as life-giving. (Art. 11.)

8. Words of Christ, relating to Godhead or Manhood, are words of One Person. (Art. 4.)

9. He Himself became our High Priest. (Art. 10.)

10. The Spirit's relation to Him is not exterior. (Art. 9.)

11. "Theotocos." (Art. 1.)

The 7th Art. is not a condensation of any passage in the letter.

Tillemont, xiv. 454. See the letter in Mansi, iv. 1061. It is of considerable importance, for it fully bears out Cyril's doctrinal contention. "If we do not accept what the term signifies, we are greatly in error, or rather we imperil our belief in the ineffable 'economy' of the Only-begotten Son. For it will follow at once . . . that He who undertook the ineffable economy for our sakes is not God, and

to give up his objections to the term “Theotocos,” seeing that the true sense of that term was part of the Church’s faith. But when he read the twelve Articles, which Nestorius sent to him apart from the “third letter,” he was shocked with what appeared to him a decided affinity to the heresy of Apollinaris<sup>a</sup>. He desired Andrew, bishop of Samosata, to confute them; and Andrew produced a criticism which was published in the name of the “Eastern” Bishops. But he applied to a more accomplished controversialist in the person of Theodoret, who undertook the task, and sent back to John his observations on the Articles, with a letter prefixed, in which he professed to think it possible that some “enemy of the truth” had been misusing Cyril’s name. Cyril’s expectation of a summary settlement of the question had been baffled by the imperial summons of a General Council, which necessarily suspended all proceedings against Nestorius: and he employed himself, during the earlier part of 431, in replying to Andrew and to Theodoret<sup>b</sup>, and in writing his “Refutation” of Nestorius in five books. Even when the Council met at Ephesus, and condemned Nestorius on the 22nd of June, it expressed no opinion on the merits of the twelve Articles; and Cyril, while undergoing detention at Ephesus during the harassing period which followed on the close of the Council’s work, yielded to the request of friends that he would write a further “Explanation” of his Articles. From these documents we can form a correct notion of the objections taken, and of the replies offered,—as follows.

Anath. I. “If any one does not acknowledge that the Emmanuel is very God, and therefore the Holy Virgin is God’s Mother (Theotocos)—, for she bore, in fleshly manner (*σαρκικῶς*) that Word from God who became flesh; let him be anathema<sup>c</sup>.”

that God the Word did not, by lowering (lit. emptying) Himself into the form of a servant, exhibit in our interest an unspeakably vast benignity (*φιλαρθρωπίαν*); whereas the Divine Scriptures give us the strongest assurance of that benignity when they assert that the coeternal and Only-begotten Son of God, who was before the ages, condescended to be born of a Virgin, *ἀπαθῶς*.” John holds Nestorius responsible for the stirring up of the controversy: he presumes that his meaning is orthodox: he admits that Celestine’s allowance of “ten days” is scanty, but adds, “yet the thing *can* be done in one day, or even in a few hours,” if Nestorius would consult with some true friends who could freely tell him “what was ad-

vantageous, though it might not be agreeable.”

<sup>a</sup> He afterwards wrote to Theodosius II. that Acacius bishop of Beroea (an old man, once the enemy of S. Chrysostom) thought the articles Apollinarian, Mansi, v. 782. In 432 he wrote to Cyril that at first he could not believe them to be his, ib. 857. See too Theod. Epist. 112, that John denounced them as Apollinarian, “before we went to Ephesus.”

<sup>b</sup> See the Apologies “adv. Orientales” and “adv. Theodoretum” in P. E. Pusey’s edition of the Cyrillicine writings relating to the Council of Ephesus, pp. 261 ff. 381 ff. A Latin version is given by Marius Mercator.

<sup>c</sup> It was for the sake of the Son that Cyril emphasized this title of the

To this it was objected (1) that “in fleshly manner” was inconsistent with the Virginal Nativity; (2) that the phrase might suggest a change of the Word into flesh; (3) that if John 1. 14 were pressed too rigorously, the texts which describe Christ as “made sin,” or “made a curse,” would have to be pressed as far<sup>d</sup>. These were Andrew’s objections on the part of “Eastern bishops.” Theodoret, for his part, said in effect, (4) God the Word could undergo no change: He did not actually become flesh, He assumed flesh animated and with a rational soul; therefore He was not by nature born of the Virgin, but was present with and united to her Child, and it is in this sense that the term Theotocos is orthodox<sup>e</sup>.

Cyril answered (1) that his language fully recognised the miraculousness of the Nativity; (2) that the Union, as he conceived of it, involved no confusion<sup>f</sup>, and that the term Theotocos did not mean Mother of the Word as God, but guarded the truth that Mary’s Son was God Incarnate; (3) that the texts as to sin and a curse were not parallel to John 1. 14, for they could only mean that Christ was reckoned as among sinners, or called accursed. He adduced passages from Peter of Alexandria, from Athanasius, e. g. one from c. 2 of Athanasius’ letter to Epictetus, and from Amphilius of Icōnium. (4) He contended that Theodoret’s position was ambiguous: that it was admitted on all hands that the Incarnation involved no change in God, and that the Word really became man, while continuing to be God. Therefore the term Theotocos was orthodox, while the term Anthropotocos was superfluous<sup>g</sup>. He added that Theodoret must, from his own words, be regarded as holding a real Union. In his “Explanation” he urges that the Nicene Creed implied an ineffable Union without any “change” or “confusion:” and that “Theotocos” was necessary in order to guard the true sense of “Emmanuel.”

Mother, which does not appear in the second Ep. to Nest. until close to the end, and which is the subject of the 11th section of the third Ep. to which the Articles are appended. In both cases we find the needful caveat,—“not that the Word’s nature or God-head had its origin “from the Virgin,” or “from flesh.” Nestorius, in the first of his counter-anathemas, preserved in Latin by Marius Mercator, condemns those who call the Emmanuel God the Word, &c. On this shewing, says Mercator, “God the Word did *not* dwell among us;” and what becomes of the name Emmanuel? It suggests a present God: but it is turned into the title of a

man. (Baluz. p. 143.)

<sup>d</sup> Compare Nestorius, Sermon 4, in Mercator. (Baluz. p. 81.) Athanasius interprets those texts to mean that Christ took on Him the curse, and bore our sins, *Orat. c. Ari. ii. 47.*

<sup>e</sup> This was quoted as Nestorianizing language in the Fifth General Council, *Mansi. ix. 290.*

<sup>f</sup> In his letter on the Holy Symbol, Epist. p. 181, he excludes not only fusion or blending, but “what some talk of as *συνουσιωσιν . . .*” “It is impossible.”

<sup>g</sup> Alexander of Hierapolis demanded that Theotocos should never be used without Anthropotocos. *Mansi. v. 875.*

Anath. II. "If any one does not acknowledge that the Word from God the Father has been united hypostatically (*καθ' ὑπόστασιν*) with flesh, and that He is one Christ with His own flesh, that is, the same at once God and man; let him be anathema<sup>h</sup>."

The Easterns do not comment on this; but Theodoret practically asks, "What does union by hypostasis mean? I suspect it is the notion of "fusion" in disguise<sup>i</sup>." Cyril answers that Nestorianism has made the new phrase necessary: and that it means simply that there is *one* Christ, God and Man,—which truth, he adds, Theodoret himself holds. In his "Explanation" he gives the same account.

Anath. III. "If any one divides the Hypostases after the Union, in regard to the one Christ, connecting them by a mere connection (*οτροφεία*) of dignity or authority or power, instead of a meeting by 'natural' union; let him be anathema<sup>k</sup>."

It was objected by "the Easterns" that (1) Cyril in his first work<sup>1</sup> on the controversy had appeared to recognize "two hypostases;" that (2) to call the Union natural was to deny its supernatural character, to make it a mere result of physical law. (3) Theodoret objected that there was no real opposition between "connection" and "meeting;" (4) that "natural" implied necessity: (5) that "hypostasis" meant "nature,"<sup>m</sup> and as we may say "two natures" in man, there could be no harm in "dividing the hypostases" in the Christ.

Cyril answers that (1) there is no inconsistency between his earlier and later language: he recognizes a distinction between the Godhead and the Manhood; what he has to insist on is the unity of the subject or Person: (2) by "natural" he means "real," and Nestorius by asserting a community of honour between the Word and the Christ has made it necessary for him to assert an unity. An allusion to Apol-

<sup>h</sup> This objection to the phrase "hypostatic union" was quoted against him in the Fifth Council. Mansi, ix. 290.

<sup>i</sup> The sense of *καθ' ὑπόστασιν* seems to be, in His very actual self, in His true personal being. See Art. 3, against a duality of "hypostases" in the Christ, and above in the Epistle, *ὑποτάσσει μαζὶ . . . συσπαρκευμένη*, and also adv. Theod. 2. Such a "hypostatic union" is grounded on the proposition, There is but One Son. In his anathema Nestorius condemned any who said that the combination of God the Word with flesh involved a local change of the Divine essence, or an extension of the flesh to take in God, &c. Mercator remarks, "As if *that* followed" from the hypostatic

union! Bahiz, p. 147.

<sup>k</sup> Cf. Ep. ad Nest. 3, 4, 5, that to talk of such a connection is *κενοφωνία* and nothing else. Nestorius' anathema shews how desirous he was of securing the idea that the tie between God and man in Christ involves no confusion. But he speaks (in language, it must be said, which of itself might bear a sound sense) of "the man assumed by the Word;" he still aims, says Mercator, at bringing in the one Son by nature, and another linked to Him by association, who is not to be called either Son or God, except by fiction.

<sup>1</sup> Ep. to the Monks, c. 15, p. 11.

<sup>m</sup> See the Tome, c. 6; ad Afros, 4. In his "Dialogues" Theodoret makes hypostasis mean person.

linarianism in the Easterns' remarks he meets full in front: "With the doctrines of Apollinaris we have no concern whatever." (3) He charges Theodoret with uttering a truism; (4) repeats his explanation of "natural union," and sets aside as frivolous the attempt to make "natural" mean "necessary." His object, he says, is to exclude such a so-called union as is merely accidental and moral. (5) As for the analogy of soul and flesh in man, Theodoret would not separate them in the concrete<sup>n</sup>: and it is agreed on both sides that abstractedly Godhead and Manhood stand apart. Similarly, in the Explanation, he repeats that an association between a Divine and a human person is not an Incarnation of the one Son of God.

Anath. IV. "If any one assigns to two Persons or hypostases the expressions in the Gospels and Apostolic writings, used either of Christ by the saints, or by Christ of Himself, and refers the one set to a man considered by himself apart from the Word who is from God, and the other set, as appropriate to the Divinity, to the Word who is from God the Father; let him be anathema<sup>o</sup>.

"We also believe," says Andrew in effect, "in the completeness and inseparableness of the Union: but we object to any confusion or want of distinction, between the properties of Godhead and Manhood,—it tends to an Arian debasement of the former." Theodoret takes the same line, and insists that such sayings "as Neither the Son," "If it be possible, let this cup pass away," "Save Me from this hour," "Why hast thou forsaken Me?" could not be ascribed to God the Word<sup>p</sup>. Cyril replies that Nestorius denounced "Theotocos" as an Apollinarian symbol, equivalent to "Mother of the Godhead," and that, as the Easterns really held the Personal Union, they ought not to complain of a phrase which simply assumed it; they were making out differences which did not exist. For himself, he fully admits that some Scriptural sayings were appropriate to the Divinity, others to the Humanity, and Christ, as God and Man, spoke now Divinely, now humanly; but what he in-

<sup>n</sup> This analogy is recognised by Cyril in his first letter to Succensus, his letter to Valerian, and in his Scholia, 8, 27, where he remarks that it must not be regarded as perfect. See below, on Theod. Dial. ii. Cyril clearly means, not that soul and flesh are blended in man, but that they constitute one man.

<sup>o</sup> Here *προσώποις* occurs, clearly in its ecclesiastical sense. This article is referred to by Cyril in Epist. p. 116, 147. He explains that to own the

distinction of words relating to Divinity and to humanity (as did the "Antiochenes" in the formulary of union,) was not to distribute them between the Word and a human individual, and so to incur this anathema. The Nestorian anathema virtually charged him with applying these texts to "one nature," and thus attributing sufferings to the Word in Godhead both in flesh and in Godhead.

<sup>p</sup> Cited as heterodox in the Fifth General Council, Mansi, ix. 290.

sisted was that both sets of sayings belong to the one Christ<sup>4</sup>. (This passage of itself would show how he came to accept the Antiochene formulary of reunion in 433, which concludes by recognizing a distinction between the sayings respecting the Lord, Ep. ad Joan.) He adds some quotations, one being from Attiens, late bishop of Constantinople<sup>5</sup>, on the antitheses of the Incarnation. (2) He remonstrates with Theodoret for misstating his meaning. I deny, he says, all fusion; I distinguish even between words of Divine and of human tone. What I plead for is that whether He spoke in majesty or in humility, it was the one Christ who spoke. Since the Word became Man, instead of linking Himself to a man, why should He not speak as Man? The text "Neither the Son," means that the Word, as Man, "appropriates" to Himself human limitations of knowledge<sup>6</sup>, just as He submitted humanly to the human sensations of hunger and weariness. (The expression, "appropriates economically," here means that He made such limitations His own in accordance with the conditions of His self-humiliation.) It is to the Word, but to the Word in His humiliation, or "self-emptying," that one must attribute the deprecations and cries of distress<sup>7</sup>. In the Explanation of this Article, Cyril summarises this answer, and withal shews that, like Eastern Fathers in general, he interpreted *οὐχ ἀπαγγέλλοντο ἡγγῆσατο τὸ εἶναι Ἰησα Θεόν* in Phil. 2. 6 as referring to the self-humiliation<sup>8</sup>, for after citing it, he adds, "but rather He lowered Himself to a voluntary emptying."

Anath. V. "If any one dares to say that Christ is a man carrying God (Θεοφόρον), and not rather that He is God in truth, as being One Son and (Son) by nature, in that the Word became flesh, and was partaker like ourselves in blood and flesh; let him be anathema."

<sup>4</sup> See below, p. 174.

<sup>5</sup> For Attiens see Soc. vii. 2, 25.

<sup>6</sup> Comp. Athan. Orat. c. Arian. iii. 42 ff. In his Thesaurus, pp. 219, 220, Cyril gives this explanation, but with it also another to the effect that He did, even as Man, know, but ἀγνοεῖν ζῆσσεν οἰκονομικῶς.

<sup>7</sup> So, ad Pulcheriam 55 (Pusey, p. 327) he treats these expressions as the utterance of the "rational soul" in Christ: in the Thesaurus, p. 233, he gives two explanations; (1) as in the text, that His "flesh" really shrank from suffering, and even that unless He had feared, nature would not have been delivered from fear; (2) another which is too unreal to be reverential, that He spoke thus in order to show that He was man.

<sup>8</sup> Compare Cyril, Quod unus sit Christus, Pusey, pp. 373, 411. Evidently he understood the clause as, "did not insist on remaining, as He might have done, in the enjoyment of His coequality, but consented to assume, by κένωσις, the form of a servant, &c."<sup>9</sup> This is what was meant by the six Bishops who wrote to Paul of Samosata, when they said that Christ emptied Himself ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶναι Ἰησα Θεόν. So Theodoret comments, "Being God, and God by nature, and having equality with the Father, He did not deem this a great thing . . . but conceded His dignity, and chose the extremity of humiliation, and took on Him a human form . . . *As man*: for the assumed nature was this: He was not this, but was

The word *Theophoros* had been applied by Nestorius to Jesus regarded as *a man*, a human individual. Theodoret claimed S. Basil's authority for it<sup>x</sup>; and also, by an "ignoratio elenchi," urged that Heb. 2. 14 was incompatible with any change of Godhead into flesh. Cyril reiterates his disclaimer of such a notion, and points out that *Theophoros* is a title fit for any holy man, in whom God "dwells<sup>y</sup>;" that in fact it suggests a relation identical in kind with the relation between Him and all true Christians. He adds another caveat against Apollinarianism;—"Flesh, I mean, not soulless nor mindless, but possessing a soul and a mind." The Easterns pass over this and the next Article. The Explanation concludes with the words, "They then who dare to say that He is a man carrying God, and not rather God who has become man, necessarily incur the aforesaid anathematism."

Anath. VI. "If any one says that the Word, who is from God the Father, is God or Lord ( $\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\tau\eta\nu$ ) of Christ, and does not rather confess that the Same is alike God and Man, since the Word became flesh, according to the Scriptures; let him be anathema<sup>z</sup>."

Theodoret says here that the human nature assumed by the Word was called "the form of a servant" with reference to that assumption itself, but after the assumption was "released from the appellation of servitude," and called "God" because of its union with the form of God. The criticism seems hardly relevant: Cyril observes that our Lord, as Man, adopted the "servitude" which belonged to His human brethren; and shews how Nestorius' words, "He, the same, was at once a babe and the babe's Lord," implied a dualism which it was needful to disallow. "The Emmanuel cannot then be called God and Lord of Himself<sup>a</sup>," and in the Explanation he says that it is most extravagant, and indeed most impious, even to think so.

Anath. VII. "If any one says that Jesus was wrought upon by God the Word, and that the glory of the Only-begotten was attached to Him as being a different (person) from the Only-begotten; let him be anathema<sup>b</sup>."

clad with this," &c.

<sup>x</sup> But he quoted S. Basil inaccurately: what Basil spoke of was "the God-bearing *flesh*," de Spir. Sanct. s. 12. Eutherius of Tyana, writing to John in 432, ignores the distinction, Mansi, v. 851.

<sup>y</sup> S. Ignatius's name of *Theophoros* is explained in the "Martydom of Ignatius" as implying, "He who carries Christ in his breast;" but Funk regards it as a Greek proper name, Patr. Apost. p. 172.

<sup>z</sup> Nestorius in his anathema insists that the Word is the Lord and Maker of the "form of a servant," and that He promised to raise it up by His own power. But he admits that Christ is God the Word, "forgetting," says Mercator sarcastically, "*his Emmanuel*," (p. 150.)

<sup>a</sup> It was quite another thing to say that He was the God or Lord of His humanity.

<sup>b</sup> Nestorius condemns those who identify the Virgin-born man with

We own, say the Easterns in effect, that He was not wrought upon as were prophets and apostles; He was not on their level. But still we must give due weight to the Scriptural assertion that God wrought mightily in Christ by raising Him from the dead, &c. Theodoret is very brief, but refers similarly to Eph. i. 29, 20. Cyril replies simply, that what he aims at is to exclude the idea of an *external* Divine operation on the Christ, seeing that He is Himself that very Word by whom the Father operates, that His Resurrection is also ascribed to Himself (e.g. S. John 2. 19,) and that it was in His Manhood that He, the Lord of glory, is said to have been glorified. So in the Explanation he says that those who hold what this Article condemns do in fact hold “two Sons.”

Anath. VIII. “If any one dares to say that ‘the man who was assumed’ ought to be adored along with God the Word<sup>c</sup>, and glorified with Him, and with Him styled God, as if different from Him (for the word ‘with,’ constantly appended, will oblige us to understand it thus) and does not rather honour the Emmanuel with one adoration, and offer to Him one glorification, since the Word became flesh; let him be anathema<sup>d</sup>.”

The Easterns here acknowledge Cyril’s principle. There are not two persons, or two Sons: there is one Son, to whom is due an adoration presupposing such unity. They only charge Cyril with a petty verbal inconsistency.

Theodoret is briefer, and acknowledges the same Christ to be both God and Man, and to be glorified as one<sup>e</sup>. He speaks, how-

the Only-begotten, instead of saying that, as united to the Only-begotten, He shares in that title. Here, says Mercator, he supposes an Only-begotten, a real Son of God, who yet is not the Emmanuel; and a “temporary” Emmanuel, who is but titularly Son of God. By united, he meant associated.

<sup>c</sup> Theodore had said that the Word gave to the man by whom He determined to judge all men the privilege of joint reception of adoration, so that all should render due worship to the Divine nature, but should include in that adoration him who was inseparably joined to Him, &c. Mansi, ix. 207.

<sup>d</sup> The Nestorian anathema involves a gross misrepresentation. It condemns any who say that “the form of a servant” is to be worshipped in reference to its own nature; (as if Cyril had said so!) and asserts that it ought to be venerated for its con-

nection with the nature of the Only-begotten. Cyril’s anathema is developed in the ninth of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, Mansi, ix. 381. “If any one says that Christ is adored in two natures, whereby two adorations are brought in, one proper to God the Word, and one proper to man: or if any one adores Christ on the theory of a taking away of the flesh, or a confusion of the Godhead and the Manhood, or as imagining one nature or essence of the elements that have come together, and does not adore by one adoration God the Word as incarnate, with his own flesh . . . let such a person be anathema.” Hence, no adoration is to be offered to the Humanity conceived of as apart from the Godhead: all adoration of the Incarnate must have respect to His one indivisible Person.

<sup>e</sup> Similarly, many years later, Theodoret wrote to Flavian, “Him

ever, of “the man” as not losing what he was. Cyril replies that what he objects to is the notion of a duality of persons: and that “the man assumed by God the Word” is a phrase which would favour that notion. His Explanation adds nothing to these statements.

Anath. IX. “If any one says that the one Lord Jesus Christ was glorified by the Spirit, in that He used the power that came through Him as if it were foreign to Himself, and received from Him the capacity of energising against unclean spirits, and of performing Divine miracles before men, instead of saying that the Spirit through whom He wrought the miracles was His own: let him be anathema <sup>f</sup>.”

The Easterns again try to fasten on Cyril a charge of inconsistency. “Formerly (in Epistle to the Monks) he owned that Christ acted by the Spirit of God, and even was quickened by Him: now he seems to deny this, and to forget the text, ‘If I by the Spirit of God cast out devils.’ (2) And to call the Spirit the Son’s *own* is to impair the undivided action of the whole Trinity.” (3) Theodoret again falls into an “*ignoratio elenchi*,” attacking an imagined denial of the anointing, &c. of Jesus by the Spirit, and accusing Cyril of anathematising prophets, apostles, Gabriel, Christ Himself. (4) He grants that the Spirit is the Son’s own Spirit; but denies that He has His being “from” or “through” the Son <sup>g</sup>. Cyril tells the Easterns that their first objection is a mere cavil: he had said that Christ’s miracles were wrought by the Spirit as His own Spirit: among these, of course, he included the casting out of devils. (2) His point was that the relation of the Spirit to Christ was not, as in the case of saints, an exterior relation: and in order to bring this out, he had called the Spirit Christ’s “own,” not that He was not also the Father’s own, but that He did not thus belong to any holy *man* as such. (3) Theodoret should bear in mind some words of Nestorius, which appeared <sup>h</sup> to identify Christ’s relation to the Spirit with any

(Christ) I know to be both God before the ages, and Man at the end of the days, and I offer one adoration as to the Only-begotten.” Epist. 104. On this adoration of the Incarnate, see Athan. ad Adelph. 2.

<sup>f</sup> In the Epistle, c. 10, he urges that Christ was not glorified by the Spirit as by an exterior power, for the Spirit is His own, and “is poured forth from Him, even as out of God the Father.” Nestorius, by his anathema, implies that some process of mediation went on between the Word and the

Holy Spirit: which Mercator calls “*inaudita*.”

<sup>g</sup> See Swete’s Hist. Doctr. of Process. of Holy Spirit, p. 139 ff. tracing Theodoret’s language on this point to Theodore, the most extreme representative of the Antiochene school, as opposed to the Alexandrian. In the creed ascribed to Theodore it is expressly said that the Spirit has not “His existence through the Son.” Mansi, iv. 1348.

<sup>h</sup> The words were, “This Spirit which bestowed on Christ such glory,

ordinary man's: it was this notion that he had aimed at in his anathematism. (4) "The Holy Spirit, as our Saviour says, proceeds from God the Father, but He is not foreign to the Son: for *He* has all things with the Father." In *this* passage he does not affirm what Theodoret denied, that the Spirit exists from or through the Son: but merely that since "all things that the Father hath are the Son's," the Spirit who proceeds from the Father must needs be the Son's own, not exterior to Him: even as S. Paul interchanges the phrases, "Spirit of God" and "Spirit of Christ<sup>i</sup>. And now, in his turn, Cyril becomes unfair to Theodoret: for he quotes Theodore's words, to the effect that Gabriel had predicted that the Christ after the flesh should be born of the Holy Spirit, as if they implied a separate human Christ,—which they certainly do not. In the Explanation he says that the Word, when He became man, continued to be God, being all that the Father was, Fatherhood only excepted: "and therefore in working miracles He had as His own that Holy Spirit which is from Him (ἐξ αὐτοῦ) and essentially innate in Him<sup>k</sup>." This is stronger language as to the real derivation of the Spirit from the Son than he had used in his reply to Theodoret.

Anath. X. "Divine Scripture says that Christ was made a High Priest and Apostle of our confession, and He offered Himself for us to God the Father for an odour of sweet smell. If any one says that it was not the actual Word from God who was made an High Priest<sup>1</sup> and Apostle when He became flesh, and a man like ourselves, but another man born of a woman, apart from Him; or, if any one

Heb. 3. 1.  
Eph. 5. 2.

which made Him formidable to demons, which bestowed on Him His assumption into Heaven." In themselves, however, they admitted of a sound sense. Theodore had said much more broadly that Jesus was led by the Spirit to His duty, even as they who are led by the Spirit are called sons of God, and that He received justification from, and was made spotless by the Spirit, Mansi, ix, 205.

<sup>1</sup> He avoids, here, the question of eternal derivation, and only says that since the Son has what the Father has, He may be said to have as His own the Spirit who proceeds from the Father. This is not to "imply," as Mr. Swete represents him, (Hist. Doctr. of Holy Spirit, p. 143) that there is a sense in which the Spirit may be said to be from the Son without blasphemy; for although elsewhere Cyril says as much, (see next note) he does not say so here. See Pearson on Creed, ii, 435. Theodo-

ret affirms the single Procession in Hier. Fab. v. 3, written very late in his life. Mr. Swete says that Theodoret confined the Spirit's relation to the Son to "consubstantiality" and "mission."

<sup>k</sup> Quoted by Dr. Pusey, "On the clause, 'And the Son,'" p. 130, together with other passages; e. g. The-saurus, p. 354, "The Spirit being by nature in Him and out of (ἐξ) Him," and in De recta fide ad Theod. c. 36, (Pusey, p. 120) the Spirit which is both ἐξ αὐτοῦ and ἐδον αὐτοῦ. In the passage in Ep. ad Nest. 3, 10, the words "He (the Spirit) is poured forth παρ αὐτοῦ even as ἐκ τοῦ . . . Πατρὸς" refer to the Mission, but the Mission from the Son is based on an essential derivation from the Son in Thesaurus, p. 358, &c.

<sup>1</sup> See Nestorius in Cyril adv. Nest. iii. 1, and his third Sermon ap. Mercator. Proclus had said that "God became a Priest," Homily, c. 3.

says that He offered the oblation for Himself also, and not for us alone (for He who knew no sin would not have needed an oblation) let him be anathema <sup>m</sup>."

The Easterns here insist on our Lord's Humanity as characterising His Priesthood. "God the Word," they say, "could not be our Priest," meaning, obviously, *as* God the Word: for they proceed to admit the personal unity. "The union," they say emphatically, "remains for ever: at the same time, amid the sufferings of the flesh, the Godhead, though inseparable, remained impassible . . . Wherefore we acknowledge one and the same as Son, the natures remaining unblended (*ἀσύγχρωτοι*) and we say not, one and another, God forbid! but one and the same;" and they proceed to describe Christ as our High Priest, but *not* as a human person apart from the Word. Theodoret infers from Heb. 5. 1 ff that He who was "made perfect through sufferings, and by experience of suffering learned obedience, and offered up supplications with tears to Him who could save Him from death," could not be the impassible Word, but *that* which was assumed by the Word, which was mortal and passible <sup>n</sup>, &c. Here he does not say "he who was assumed;" yet at the close of his objection he drifts back, as it were, into Nestorianising language: Jesus was called, in Heb. 3. 1, "faithful to Him that made him;" but no orthodox person would apply the phrase, "a thing made," to the Word, but to "*Him* who was of the seed of David."

Cyril answers the Easterns at some length; in the course of his remarks he quotes a passage from Nestorius to the effect that He who was sent to be our High Priest "advanced by degrees to the High-priestly dignity." This might assuredly bear a sound sense; but Cyril vehemently denounces it as quite irreconcileable with the personal Divinity of our Lord. He then says that what he contends for is this—that Jesus, our High Priest, is God who has become Man, is our High Priest as having become Man<sup>o</sup>, and could not have

<sup>m</sup> In the basis passage, Ep. ad Nest. 3. 9, he insists that the Son became the Mediator, and offered up His own body, not for Himself but for us: and we do not assign to a man different from Himself (i.e. to a merely human Christ) "the name and the reality of Priesthood." The Nestorian article insists on assigning, as regards "oblationem," "que Dei" to the Only-begotten, "que hominis" to the man united to Him, i.e. to the human and titular Emmanuel.

<sup>n</sup> The passage was quoted as heterodox in the Fifth General Council, Mansi, ix. 291.

<sup>o</sup> Both parties reject the Arian notion (found, e.g. in Milton) "that our Lord's Priesthood preceded His Incarnation, and belonged to His Divine nature, and was in consequence the token of an inferior divinity . . . . The Catholic doctrine is, that the Divine Word is Priest *in* and *according to* His Manhood," Newman, Athan. Treatises, ii. 245, ed. 2. i. e. so far as relates to sacrificial Priesthood, as distinct from that sort of Mediation which belongs to Him as Word. Theodoret says in Epist. 145, "He "is called an High Priest not as God, "but as Man, and He offers as man,

been so if He had not become Man. To Theodoret he replies that Nestorius had imagined a merely accidental and moral union: he lays <sup>2 Cor. 8.</sup> stress on the text, "Though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor," as incompatible with such a theory: he urges that the vast condescensions of God should not be cavilled at as humiliating to His Majesty, but welcomed as marvellous evidences of His love, and that although the High Priesthood in question was dependent on our Lord's Humanity, it was exercised by Him as personally Divine. Similarly, in the Explanation, he says, that "being by nature Lord of the universe, He lowered Himself . . . and was called our High Priest . . . inasmuch as the limitations of His humanity imposed this office upon Him."

Anath. XI. "If any one does not acknowledge the Lord's flesh to be lifegiving, and proper to the Word Himself who is from God the Father, but regards it as the flesh of some other than Himself, who was connected with Him in dignity, or who really had God dwelling within him, and not as lifegiving, as we said, because it became proper to the Word who has power to give life to all things; let him be anathema p."

The Easterns' criticism is here peculiarly captious. Of course, they say, all admit that Christ's flesh "belongs" to Him, and not to any one else; therefore, this reiteration of "proper" is suspicious; it seems to intimate an Apollinarian idea, as if His flesh were not of human origin. 2) And why should Cyril condemn the phrase, "connected with Him by dignity," when he had himself acknowledged the exaltation of humanity in Christ? 3) Theodoret owns the Word to have flesh, but asks, Why not add "mind?" and treats Cyril's admission of the diversity of the two natures as wrung from him. Here again Theodoret is conspicuously unfair. Cyril answers; By calling the flesh the Word's own, I meant to exclude the notion that it belonged

"but He receives the Sacrifice as 'God, with the Father and the Holy Spirit.' Compare Cyril adv. Nest. iii. 2, that the Word, as Man, is acting as Priest in heaven.

<sup>v</sup> Cp. Ep. ad Nest. 3. 7. "We celebrate the bloodless service, and approach to the sacred Eucharistic elements, and are sanctified by being made partakers of the holy Flesh and precious Blood . . . and not as if receiving common flesh, or that of a man connected with the Word by oneness of dignity, or as having God dwelling in him; but as truly lifegiving, and as the Word's own flesh.

For being by nature life, as God, when He became one with His own flesh, He rendered ( $\alpha\piέφηνεν$ ) it lifegiving." Nestorius anathematizes any who say that the flesh united (i. e. conjoined) to the Word is by its own natural capacity lifegiving, contrary to S. John 6. 63. Another ignoratio elenchi. Cyril calls it lifegiving as being the Life-giver's own, in ad Puleheriam, c. 56 (Pusey, p. 329); "when He made the body received from the Holy Virgin His own, He rendered it lifegiving, and with good reason, for it is the body of the all-quickening Life."

to a separate human person : it was Nestorius's absurd remark, that our Lord said, " He who eateth My Flesh," not, " He who eateth My Godhead <sup>q</sup>," which constrained me to show that His Flesh was " proper to the Word." Let us not, he adds, complain of the vastness of the Condescension, but recognise the body of Christ, in Athanasius's language, as the Body of the Incarnate Word. He disclaims the notion that it came down from heaven, as unsupported by the words of S. John 3. 13. Theodoret, he observes, might as well ask why mind was not mentioned in S. John 1. 14. " Flesh " is often used to signify the whole of man. In the Explanation he emphasises that reference to the Holy Eucharist which had been made in the Third Epistle. " We perform the holy and lifegiving and bloodless Sacrifice in the churches, not believing that which is set before us (*προκείμενον*) to be the body of a common man, one of ourselves, nor again the precious Blood; but rather receiving them as having become the Body and Blood which belong to the Word who gives life to all things. For common flesh cannot give life, and this the Saviour Himself attests, saying, ' The flesh profiteth nothing : the spirit is that which gives life.' For since it has become the Word's own, on this account it is thought of as, and is, lifegiving <sup>r</sup>."

Anath. XII. " If any one does not acknowledge that the Word of God suffered in flesh, and was crucified in flesh, and tasted death in flesh, and became firstborn from the dead, in that He is life and lifegiving, as God ; let him be anathema <sup>s</sup>."

Again the Easterns try to set Cyril against Cyril. In his Epistle to the Monks, they say, he admitted the impassibility of the Godhead. How then could the Word be said to suffer ? " It was not God, connected with the flesh who suffered : it was the flesh united to God the Word which suffered what was natural to it, by His own permission :" qualifying the phrase, " suffered *in flesh*," does not save the impassibility. It still comes to this, the Word was passible. In accordance with His own nature ? In that case, either the Father is also passible, or the Word's Deity is other than His, i. e. the Word is not coessential. Or was it contrary to His Nature ? But how could He be under duress ? If it be said, " He had a fitting object,

<sup>q</sup> See this in adv. Nest. iv. 6. Cyril is justly severe on this absurd specimen of false antithesis.

<sup>r</sup> In adv. Nest. iv. 5 he contends that the benefits of the Holy Communion are not to be limited to a reception of the *Holy Spirit*.

<sup>s</sup> Here to read the article apart from the letter might have an unfortunate effect. For it is the letter that

has the salvo, " although He was impassible in His own nature," and " He was in the crucified body, appropriating to Himself, impassibly, the sufferings of His own flesh." The Nestorian article is unobjectionable. It merely forbids to assign the sufferings alike to the Word and to the flesh, " sine discretione dignitatis naturarum."

the salvation of man," could that end be promoted by a debasement of Deity? Theodoret's criticism contains one of his Nestorianising passages: "It was not God who suffered, but the man who was assumed from among us by God<sup>1</sup>." Cyril tells the Easterns that they are "beating the air," and refuting what nobody holds. Of course the Word could not suffer as God, but only as having appropriated the possible condition of humanity. To suffer in flesh, is *not* to suffer in Godhead: and Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, and Athanasius<sup>2</sup> bear witness to this idea. He takes the same ground in answer to Theodoret, and concludes with the weighty remark, that if we would appreciate the redemptive virtue of the Passion, we must ascribe it to One who is Himself "the Lord of glory, God over all, blessed for ever. Amen." The same thought is summarised in the *Explanation*.

The criticisms to which Cyril's "Articles" were subjected by the Easterns, and which called forth from him repeated elucidations of his meaning, did what nothing else could have done, and what was eminently necessary to be done, if the balance of doctrinal truth was to be preserved. They kept before his mind the necessity of self-explanation; and they prepared him ultimately to resume communion with John of Antioch, and with the more moderate of the Easterns. He had indeed refused the proposal conveyed to him in 432<sup>3</sup>, though Acacius of Beroea, to the effect that he should withdraw his "articles and letters," and be content with Athanasius' letter to Epictetus as a comment upon the Nicene Creed. But his reply to Acacius, in which he promised that, when peace had been restored on the basis of the condemnation of Nestorianism and a recognition of the deposition of Nestorius, he would explain, as to brethren, "whatever points in his articles had not been understood<sup>4</sup>," seemed to open a prospect of reconciliation, which by this time, and under strong urgency from the court, had become acceptable to John. The letter, indeed, was not satisfactory to Andrew of Samosata, who gives a curious account of a dream in which he seemed to see Apollinaris alive again and giving presents (eulogiae) to the bishop of Antioch; but he thought it necessary to "economise," and make some show of concession<sup>5</sup>. Theodoret considered the letter to be orthodox, and irreconcileable with the obnoxious Cyrilline articles, which he had again assailed in a treatise called *Pentalogus*<sup>6</sup>; while Alexander of Hierapolis read it as reaffirming

<sup>1</sup> The expression, "God the Word suffered in flesh," is again elaborately censured by Theodoret in his 3rd Dialogue. But the difference between Cyril and himself on this point appears verbal. See below.

<sup>2</sup> *Orat.* c. *Ari.* iii. 32.

<sup>3</sup> See *Synodicon*, v. 53, 54; *Mansi*, v. 829, 830.

<sup>4</sup> See a Latin version of this letter in *Synod.* 56; *Mansi*, v. 831.

<sup>5</sup> *Synodicon*, 59, 63.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* 60, 65, 70. See *Theod.* *Epist.* 112.

them, and flatly refused to have any part in a negotiation with the writer<sup>b</sup>. It was however determined that Paul, bishop of Emesa<sup>c</sup>, should visit Alexandria as John's agent. He brought a letter in which Cyril was requested to withdraw his articles, and to give further explanation of his meaning according to the promise contained in his letter to Acacius. The letter was displeasing to Cyril<sup>d</sup>; but when Paul produced, as a new basis of reunion, a doctrinal formulary which was, in fact, a recension of one drafted by the Antiochenes at Ephesus, in 431<sup>e</sup>, as a counter-document to Cyril's articles, the latter accepted it, although its wording was somewhat different from his favourite phraseology. After a preamble, it proceeded thus<sup>f</sup>;

“We acknowledge one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Only-begotten, perfect God and perfect Man<sup>g</sup>, of a reasonable soul and a body<sup>h</sup>: begotten of the Father before the ages, as to the Godhead, but at the end of the days, the Selfsame, of the Virgin Mary, as to the Manhood, for us and for our salvation: the same coessential with the Father as to the Godhead, and coessential with us as to the Manhood<sup>i</sup>. For there took place a union of two natures: therefore we acknowledge one Christ, one Son, one Lord<sup>k</sup>. According to this conception of the Union without confusion we acknowledge the Holy Virgin to be God's Mother, because God the Word was incarnate, and became Man, and from the very conception united to Himself the temple which He received from her<sup>l</sup>. As for the Evangelical

<sup>b</sup> Ib. 65, 67.

<sup>c</sup> For Paul see Tillemont, xiv. 528. Compare John's letter, Synod. 76.

<sup>d</sup> “This letter,” he says, “I did not accept,” Epist. p. 111. See it in Synod. 80.

<sup>e</sup> See Synod. 22. Cf. Tillemont, xiv. 531.

<sup>f</sup> Cyril, Ep. ad Joan. (Pusey, p. 44.)

<sup>g</sup> Compare this phrase in Athan. c. Apollin. i. 16; and see the Quicunque. Alexander had recently urged that Cyril should be required to own Christ to be both God and Man, Synod. 58.

<sup>h</sup> Compare the Quicunque.

<sup>i</sup> This phrase, which occurs in Nestorius' 3rd Sermon, preached in reply to Proclus, (see Marius Mercator, p. 72, ed. Baluz.) was not in general use among Churchmen at this time, Newman's Athan. Treat. i. 168. It received ecumenical sanction by being inserted into the “Definition” of Chalcedon. Yet Cyril had owned in adv. Nest. iii. 3 that the Son had become “coessential with us,” that is,

man.” Eutyches had never, until his trial in 448, admitted that Christ was “coessential with us as man.” Vincent of Lerins, in 434, said that Christ's human “substance” was “consubstantialis matri,” Communit. 13.

<sup>k</sup> Here the sense of “an union of two natures” is defined to be their union in one personality. This, as distinct from any “fusion” which would absorb one into the other, or blend one with the other, was what Cyril had maintained: and, as he afterwards pointed out, when the Easterns admitted this, they made a chasm between themselves and Nestorianism, Epist. to Acac. Melit. (in Epistles, p. 115.)

<sup>l</sup> According to Nestorius, He who was born of Mary was not God the Word, but a titular Emmanuel: and the “temple,” in his way of speaking, meant, not the body assumed by the Divine Son or Word, but this human Christ who became His habitation. See Marius Mercator, pp. 143, 55.

and Apostolical sayings respecting the Lord, we know that theologians make some common, as relating to the one Person, and distinguish others as belonging to two natures<sup>m</sup>, and that they refer to Christ's Godhead those which indicate Divine majesty, and to the Manhood those which indicate humiliation."

Paul found Cyril unexpectedly easy to treat with<sup>n</sup>; received from him a corresponding profession of faith<sup>o</sup>, and after disowning Nestorius in a written document, and publicly affirming the Theotocos by word of mouth<sup>p</sup>, was allowed to communicate, and even to preach in the cathedral of Alexandria, on Christmas Day 432. He delighted his auditors by announcing the good tidings of the Nativity in the unequivocal sentence, "Mary, God's Mother, gives birth to the Emmanuel<sup>q</sup>!" He added that the Word had "completely assumed our nature," and disclaimed all belief in a "Quaternity." He preached again on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January<sup>r</sup>, taking care to insist on the impossibility of the Word in His Godhead, and explaining "The Word became flesh" as equivalent to, "He assumed our flesh and dwelt in our nature," so that this text indicated the one Person and two Natures: and Cyril, in a short address, approved of Paul's statements. It must have been a great satisfaction to him to answer Paul's question, "Do you accept Athanasius' letter to Epictetus?" by comparing Paul's copy with the authentic text, proving that it represented a corrupt text, and permitting him to make correct copies for use in Syria<sup>s</sup>. But some further negotiations were required by John's reluctance to acquiesce in the condemnation of Nestorius. On this point Cyril firmly insisted<sup>t</sup>: he had the support of Theodo-

<sup>m</sup> Properly, all belong to the one Person, as Athanasius intimates, *Orat.* c. *Ari.* iii. 41, and as Cyril explains in *Epistles* p. 117, 131, 150, and *Theodore* admits, *Dial.* iii. (cp. *Hooker* v. 53. 4.) but some texts specially refer to Him as both God and Man, e.g. (as Cyril says in *Ep.* 1 to *Acac.* *Melit.* and *Ep.* 2 to *Succensus*) *Heb.* 13. 8, *Rom.* 9. 5. The distinction, says Cyril to *Acacius*, might seem subtle, but it had been thought necessary as a safeguard against *Apolinarianism*, and also against the *Arian* sense of applying the texts of the humanity to the "Divinity" (in a degraded sense of the term.) John, it seems, wrote to some friends, that Cyril now clearly admitted the difference of the natures, and divided the sayings between the natures. Cyril explained to *Acacius*, that he had written to John that he "knew that

the Lord spoke both θεοπεπώσ and ἀνθρωπίνως." Thereupon John replied that it was therefore necessary to distinguish the texts. But "these words," Cyril adds, "are his, not mine," *Epist.* p. 120. Yet the idea which they represent is expressed in *Apol.* *adv.* *Orient.* 4.

<sup>n</sup> *Ep. ad Joan.* (Pusey, p. 42.) Paul, however, had to give up pleading for certain Nestorianising prelates who had been deposed, *Cyr. Epist.* p. 157.

<sup>o</sup> Paul's *Libellus*, *Mansi*, v. 288.

<sup>p</sup> Cyril, to *Theognostus*, &c. *Epist.* p. 152.

<sup>q</sup> *Mansi*, v. 293. The people exclaimed, "This is the faith; this is what we wanted to hear."

<sup>r</sup> *Mansi*, v. 297.

<sup>s</sup> Cyril, *Epist.* pp. 120, 140, 156.

<sup>t</sup> He said in effect to Paul, "Your own declaration suffices for you per-

sius, and at last John gave way, in April of 433<sup>u</sup>. The peace being then established, Cyril wrote to John the celebrated letter, sometimes cited as “*Laetentur cœli*” from the Latin reading of its first words<sup>x</sup>. It is the letter which was associated by the Council of Chalcedon with the second letter to Nestorius, as a joint standard of orthodoxy<sup>y</sup>. In it Cyril recites the formulary which Paul had presented to him on the part of the Easterus, and repeats his own disavowal of Apollinarianism. The notion that Christ’s flesh was brought down from heaven he treats as an absurdity. He explains the sense in which Christ is called “the Lord from heaven” or “the Son of Man which came down from heaven.” He asserts the unity of the Christ, with a recognition of the difference of the natures from which the Union was effected. He urges John to “stop the mouths of those who say that the Word was commingled with flesh:” some, perhaps, accused him of holding such an notion; but he considers it as madness to impute even a “shadow of turning” to the changeless nature of the Word, who is Himself impassible, even though He attributes to Himself, “by an economic appropriation<sup>z</sup>, the suffering of that flesh which was His own.” For himself, he follows the sentiments of Fathers, “especially those of the blessed and far-famed Athanasius, avoiding any deviation whatsoever.” He sent with his letter an authenticated copy of the letter to Epictetus.

Such was the Reunion of 433. Tillemont hesitates not to say that “the Easterns rendered a great service to the Church by delaying their condemnation of Nestorianism until S. Cyril had stifled before-hand the heresy of Eutyches by expressing himself more fully than he had ever done before<sup>a</sup>. It is clear that Cyril did not get all that he might have wished for. His “Articles” were kept in the back-ground. As Theodoret took care to remark afterwards<sup>b</sup>, he did not mention them in the arrangement of the “peace:” but on the other hand, he had, shortly before, expressly declined to withdraw

sonally: but I must have a similar declaration from the bishop of Antioch.” Epist. p. 111.

<sup>u</sup> See Cyril, Epist. p. 153 for John’s letter, the form of which he himself had worded. Cf. Tillemont, xiv. 542.

<sup>x</sup> “Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; for the mid-wall of partition is broken down,” &c. Ep. to John, (Pusey, p. 40.) John thought it quite satisfactory, as expelling the idea of one nature, Synod. 86.

<sup>y</sup> Mansi, vi. 960. On hearing both these letters read, the bishops exclaimed, “So do we all believe: so does

Pope Leo believe: eternal remembrance to Cyril; as his letters run, so do we think.”

<sup>z</sup> Ὁικελωστιν οἰκονομικὴν. For οἰκελωστις compare Cyril Ep. ad Nest. 3. 6. “He was in the crucified body, ἀπαθῶς οἰκειούμενος the sufferings of His own flesh:” based on e. Apollin. ii. 16. Οἰκονομικὴν does not mean unreal, but “in accordance with the dispensation of His Incarnation,” as the context shews, αὐτὸς οἰκονομῶν τὸ μυστήριον. Cf. p. 162.

<sup>a</sup> Tillemont, xiv. 545.

<sup>b</sup> Theod. Epist. 112, written in 449.

them. The formulary supplied what was lacking in his earlier statements: it insisted on a side of truth which he had, to say the least, refrained from making prominent: if it asserted the hypostatic union in effect, and set the acknowledgment of the Theotocos on a satisfactory basis, it also excluded all negation of a real and a permanent manhood of Christ, to which should be referred the texts of the humanity. But it sufficiently guarded the oneness of Christ: and if it secured this, it secured all. The "understanding" arrived at did not escape criticism. Some adherents of the Alexandrian or Cyrilline school were alarmed at what seemed to them a compromise perilous to the truth. Not only, they observed, was the phraseology different from that of the Twelve Articles, but a celebrated phrase, not contained in the Articles, but elsewhere adduced by Cyril as found in Athanasius, was ignored, and apparently by implication proscribed. That phrase was, "One 'nature' ( $\phiύσις$ ) of God the Word, (but a nature) incarnate." The tract in which it occurs, and which Cyril took to be Athanasian<sup>c</sup>, has since his time been treated as at least dubious, and as not improbably an Apollinarian production. It was however employed by Cyril, in his treatise against Nestorius, as an affirmation of the hypostatic oneness<sup>d</sup>; in other words, he understood  $\phiύσις$  to mean the very "Ego" of the Divine Word, who could not, when He stooped to our humanity, cease to be singly and indivisibly Himself. Thus, when some of his friends in 433 expressed to him their misgivings, he answered, generally, that the Eastern "brethren" had proved themselves to be *not* Nestorians, but really believers in one Christ<sup>e</sup>; and particularly, that the formulary was not inconsistent with the phrase in question, because it

<sup>c</sup> See Leontius in Galland, xii. 739, quoting the Apollinarian Polemon as ascribing this phrase to Apollinaris; and ep. the compilation called *Patrum Doctrina de Verbi Incarnatione* in Mai's *Collect.* Nov. vii. 16.

<sup>d</sup> *Adv. Nest.* ii. 1. (Pusey, p. 94.) He is excluding a mere "accidental connection," and insisting on a "real union." "The Only-begotten," he says, "being God, became Man." That is the one point. "Thus *He* is to be thought of as one and only." Whatever is said about God or Man in the Incarnation refers to Him, is said  $\delta\sigma$   $\delta\xi$   $\xi\nu\delta$   $\pi\rho\sigma\alpha\pi\omega\nu$ . *Mία γάρ*  $\eta\delta$   $\nu\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha$   $\phiύ\sigma\iota\sigma$ ,  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$   $\tau\eta\eta$   $\iota\nu\omega\sigma\iota\sigma$ ,  $\eta$   $\alpha\eta\tau\omega$   $\tau\omega\Delta\omega\gamma\omega$   $\sigma\epsilon\sigma\alpha\kappa\omega\mu\epsilon\eta\eta$ , just as we may reasonably understand in our own case, for there is really one man composed of dissimilar things, I mean soul and body. Nothing can

be plainer than that here  $\mu\alpha$   $\phiύ\sigma\iota\sigma$   $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$  means, "Even after the Incarnation took place, He was still the one selfsame Divine Word, although He had taken our flesh." This is not Monophysitism, but orthodoxy.

<sup>e</sup> See Ep. 1, to Acacius of Melitene, Cyril, Epist. p. 113. (Here he notices an objection that the formulary of reunion was a violation of the Ephesian Council's prohibition of any "different creed," from the Nicene, and replies that to make an explanation, as the Easterns had done, is not  $\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\omega\mu\eta\sigma\alpha$   $\sigma\iota\mu\beta\omega\delta\omega\nu$ .) So Ep. 2, to Succensus, Epist. pp. 147, 149. "Wherein do the words of the Antiochene brethren agree with the novelties of Nestorius?" so Ep. to Valerian, "The Easterns then believe that His Person ( $\pi\rho\delta\sigma\omega\pi\omega\nu$ ) is one." Epist. p. 171.

affirmed that God the Word had become Man<sup>f</sup>. To him, then, the “one nature incarnate” was virtually equivalent to the “one hypostasis incarnate,” a phrase which he had himself adopted in the famous letter of “the twelve Articles<sup>g</sup>,” and it would have been well for the peace of the Church, and the due proportion of Catholic truth, if he had felt himself at liberty to substitute this phrase for the former.

On the other hand, the Reunion was not accepted by the whole of the Antiochene patriarchate. Andrew of Samosata, after some hesitation, followed John in resuming communion with Cyril<sup>h</sup>. Theodoret considered the “*Laetentur cœli*” to be satisfactory in point of doctrine, but held that to accept it and to acquiesce in the condemnation of Nestorius would be a gross inconsistency<sup>i</sup>. But he did not go so far as his own metropolitan, Alexander of Hierapolis, whose passionate attachment to the cause of Nestorius, and equally

<sup>f</sup> See Cyril. Epist. pp. 116, 133, 137. There is indeed something which at first sight needs explanation in his words to Acacius, Epist. p. 115, that “after the union of the two natures, their separation being annulled, we believe the nature of the Son to be one, but of one who became man, &c.” But what is the “separation annulled?” The diversity which in every case *except* that of the Incarnation keeps Godhead and Manhood apart. He means, “Considered apart from Christ, ‘God’ and ‘man’ represent two beings: as Christ ‘God’ and ‘man’ represent one being, who is truly God and truly Man.” The point insisted on is that our Lord is the same “He” as He was before His Incarnation: and so *μία φύσις* is presently explained by *ἐν πρόσωπον*. In Ep. 2. to Succensus he meets the objection, If Christ is perfect man as well as perfect God, man’s *φύσις* must subsist in Him: how then can there be but one *φύσις* of the Word? by explaining “one *φύσις*, but that incarnate” as=“the one and only Son of God, but the Son as having come to exist under human conditions.” Further on, he says that this *φύσις* became Man: i. e. the one Son became man. In the same letter he says, “although they speak of the *φύσις* of manhood and of Godhead in the Emmanuel, yet the manhood became the Word’s own,” and he adds that it is best to keep to the Scriptural expression, “suffered in flesh,” although the proposition,

“He suffered in the nature of manhood,” does not wrong the mystery unless it is asserted in a perverse sense, Epist. p. 145. This letter shows how he felt himself constrained to use the word *φύσις* in two senses, at the risk of some confusion. In his letter to Eulogius he says that the true sense of *μία φύσις* was acknowledged, if with some obscurity of language, by the Easterns, when they owned that the Son of God was Himself born of a woman. Epist. p. 134. See Card. Newman, *Tracts Theol.* and *Eccles.* p. 321. The Fifth Council distinguished the lawful from the unlawful use of this phrase, Anath. 8; and Aquinas explains it as meaning that “natura Verbi Dei carnem univit sibi in persona;” *Sum. 3. 2. 1.*

<sup>g</sup> Ep. ad Nest. 3. 8. (Pusey, p. 28.) In Ep. to Valerian, also, he uses *ὑπόστασις* as equivalent to *φύσις* in the comparison from soul and body making up one *ζων*, a man, Epist. p. 160. Comp. adv. Orient. 8.

<sup>h</sup> Compare Synod. 98, 106.

<sup>i</sup> Theod. Epist. 171; Synod. 95. Surely the 121st chapter of the *Synodicon*, with its bitter and perverse misrepresentations of this same letter of Cyril’s, must have been wrongly ascribed to Theodoret. He did not indeed condemn Nestorius until he was practically constrained by the Council of Chalcedon to do so, Oct. 26, 451. Later, in the “libellus” addressed to Sporacius, and in Hier. Fab. iv. 12, he spoke of Nestorius with even excessive severity.

passionate aversion to “the Egyptian,” impelled him to suspend communion with the see of Antioch itself<sup>k</sup>. And after a time, a friendly correspondence took place between Cyril and Theodoret in reference to the former’s criticism on Julian’s work against Christianity<sup>l</sup>. Here at least was common ground, on which these men, zealous Christians both, could meet and forget old quarrels. It was, unfortunately, their lot to be again in collision with each other, when in 438 Cyril denounced the theology of Diodore and Theodore<sup>m</sup>: but if we may, as surely we must, set aside the “atrocious<sup>n</sup>” letter which Theodoret was said to have written<sup>o</sup>, and the scarcely less scandalous sermon which he was said to have delivered, by way of a paean after Cyril’s death, it is reasonable to think that when that event took place in 444, Theodoret’s feelings were not inconsistent with his references in 448 to “Cyril of blessed memory<sup>p</sup>.”

But the accession of Dioscorus to the Alexandrian throne was the beginning of new troubles for Theodoret. The extreme anti-Nestorian party at Constantinople had its stronghold in the monasteries, and its representative man in Eutyches, an old archimandrite or abbot, who, as appears from the account of his trial in the November of 448, was in effect a personage of importance<sup>q</sup>; while Theodosius II. with some high officials of his court, such as Nomus and Chrysaphius<sup>r</sup>, gave practical countenance to men who regarded themselves as bound to carry on Cyril’s work, and to “stamp out” the remains of the conquered heresy. “Was not Theodoret himself open to grave suspicion? Did he not avow his attachment to the teaching of Theodore? Was he not the friend of the Nestorianising Ibas of Edessa<sup>s</sup>, and of that avowed Nestorian partisan, the ex-count

<sup>k</sup> Synod. 93, 100, 104.

<sup>l</sup> See Theodoret’s letter to Dioscorus, Ep. 83.

<sup>m</sup> See extracts from Theodoret’s reply to Cyril’s censure of Theodore’s comment on Psal. 8, quoted in the Fifth General Council, Mansi, ix. 253. Theodoret here relapses into Nestorianizing language and polemical bitterness: it was, says Tillemont, xv. 257, “the last spark” of the old fire. Before this, Cyril had been informed by a priest named Daniel, that Theodoret had not “thoroughly got rid of the stain of Nestorianism;” and he wrote in consequence to John, Synod. 210.

<sup>n</sup> Newman’s Hist. Sketches, p. 359.

<sup>o</sup> This letter is reckoned as Theodoret’s Ep. 180, (Schulze, iv. 1362.) It was read in the Fifth Council,

Mansi, ix. 295. To treat it as genuine would be to vilify Theodoret. The extract from a “sermon” is preserved by Mercator (p. 339.); it begins, “No one now compels any one to blaspheme.” See Tillemont, xiv. 784—786.

<sup>p</sup> See Theod. Epist. 83 and 86. Too much stress, indeed, should not be laid on a respectful phrase of this kind: for Theodoret appears to have seen no harm in ecclesiastical duplicities, such as he records in H. E. ii. 29; iv. II.

<sup>q</sup> See Fleury, b. 27, c. 28.

<sup>r</sup> See Tillemont, xv. 438.

<sup>s</sup> Tillemont, xv. 468. The charges against Ibas, made early in his episcopate, were renewed in 445: but the solemn trial at Antioch did not take place until 448.

Irenæus, recently in the great see of Tyre<sup>t</sup>? Was it not clear that under the pretext of denouncing a revival of Docetic and Valentinian fancies<sup>u</sup>, he was really striking at ‘the one nature of the Incarnate?’ Was he not making himself a centre of unity for Syrian bishops, holding conferences with them at Antioch, and doubtless creating a crypto-Nestorian party<sup>x</sup>?’ Some clerics of Osrhoene<sup>y</sup>, and some Eutychianising monks, ambitious, as he says, of ruling the Church<sup>z</sup>, but without any claim to consideration on the ground of learning or of services to her cause<sup>a</sup>, were active in aspersing him as a heretic. He bent himself, therefore, to the task of retorting this charge, and did so in a work to which he gave the names of “Eranistes” and “Polymorphus,” by way of indicating that the maintainers of the then “nascent<sup>b</sup>” Eutychianism were but in fact, “collectors of scraps” from “multiform” theories more or less Gnostic in character. The book, which may be assigned to 446—7<sup>c</sup>, consists of three Dialogues, known respectively by the titles “Immutabilis, Inconfusus, Impatibilis,” and followed up by a series of “proofs” cast into a “syllogistic form.” In the Dialogues, “Orthodox,” who represents Theodoret’s own position, is opposed to “Eranistes,” who stands for Eutyches, or rather, perhaps, for “Eutychians” in general. The work has been fiercely censured by Garnier<sup>d</sup>, as essentially, though not openly, Nestorian; but Tillemont drily sets aside this censor with the remark, “Sa passion est visible, et ses preuves foibles,” and ranks himself with those who hold “that the doctrine maintained in the Dialogues is as orthodox as that which he there combats is contrary to the belief of the Church<sup>e</sup>.” Certainly, if we compare the first two Dialogues with the critique on Cyril’s Articles, we should see that the stream of the writer’s thoughts, once turbid enough under the influence of friendship for Nestorius and hostility to “the Egyptian,” had now substantially worked itself clear. And although the third Dialogue is verbally antagonistic to Cyril’s last Article, Theodoret seems to hold and assert what the Article was meant to guard. On the whole, we have in the Eranistes a work of remarkable interest and of permanent value for theological students; it should be read, or at least consulted, in connection with

<sup>t</sup> Tillemont, xv. 264.

<sup>u</sup> See Theod. Epist. 82, 145.

<sup>x</sup> Epist. 82.

<sup>y</sup> Epist. 87.

<sup>z</sup> Epist. 81. Tillemont says, “These passages apply very well to Eutyches,” xv. 482.

<sup>a</sup> Preface to the Eranistes.

<sup>b</sup> Newman, Hist. Sketches iii. 338.

<sup>c</sup> He certainly refers to it in letters

of the latter part of 449, Epist. 16, 130; and probably in one of 447—8, Ep. 83. Tillemont dates the composition before Theodoret’s confinement to Cyrrhos, by an order of Theodosius, at the end of 447 or the beginning of 448, xv. 270, 275.

<sup>d</sup> Dissert. de libris Theodoreti, 2. 6. i. 13.

<sup>e</sup> Tillemont, xv. 310, 372.

the Tome of Leo and the Definition of Chalcedon. Some illustrations of its purport will be found in a letter written by Theodoret, about the same time, to Dioscorus of Alexandria<sup>f</sup>. He begins by referring to Scriptural incidents for support under the trial of misrepresentation, and proceeds, in effect, thus: “I have read your letter to archbishop **Domnus** of Antioch; I learn from it that some persons, 15 at the most, after arriving at Alexandria, accused me of having, in a sermon at Antioch, divided the one Christ into two Sons. I wish you had not believed this falsehood: I could appeal to the multitudes who have heard me preach before three bishops of Antioch during the past twenty-five years: neither bishop nor cleric has found fault with sermons of mine, and the ‘Christ-loving’ laity have always listened to me with pleasure; this I say purely in my own defence, as Paul was ‘constrained to become a fool in glorying.’ Many faults have I; but my faith, alone, as I hope, will win me pardon. I hold to the Nicene doctrine; I believe one Father, one Spirit, and one Christ, the Son of God, who became Man, and whose Mother is therefore called Theotocos. ‘Those who divide this one Christ into two persons we separate from the portion of Christ’s servants.’ In Christ is both Divinity and humanity; yet ‘it is the same who was God before the ages, and Man born of the Virgin,’ as Thomas called Him both Lord and God<sup>g</sup>. I have learned this from Scripture, and from Alexander and Athanasius, ‘who adorned your Apostolic see,’ and from Basil and Gregory, &c. That I ‘use the treatises of blessed Theophilus and Cyril, in order to stop the mouths of those who venture to gainsay, my writings themselves bear witness.’ I have quoted them against those who deny the difference between Christ’s flesh and His Godhead, and say sometimes that the Divine nature was turned into flesh, sometimes that the flesh was changed into the nature of Godhead. For those teachers plainly teach the difference between the two natures, and the immutability of the Divine: and while they call Christ’s flesh divine as having become the Word’s, they reject, as impious, the notion that its nature was changed into that of the Godhead. You know, I think, that Cyril of blessed memory often wrote to me; when he sent to John of Antioch some

<sup>f</sup> Epist. 83: Tillemont, xv. 279. Theodoret had written to Dioscorus, shortly before, professing adhesion to the compact with Cyril, and acceptance of Cyril’s letter (to John) and of Athanasius’ letter to Epictetus. Dioscorus replied by a letter to the effect that certain charges had been proved against Theodoret, see Epist. 86. Theodoret then wrote Ep. 83;

but Dioscorus paid no heed to his representations, and when those who had accused Theodoret at Alexandria anathematized him in full church, the patriarch rose and confirmed their words, Ep. 86.

<sup>g</sup> Here Theodoret departs utterly from Theodore, who explained away S. Thomas’s words as a thanksgiving to God, Mansi, ix. 209.

writings of his to be shewn to Eastern theologians, I read them with admiration, and wrote to Cyril, who replied to me, recognising my careful study and kindly feeling; and this letter of his I keep. . . . Let your Holiness turn away from false accusers, and endeavour either to reclaim those who attempt to corrupt the true doctrine, or, if they are irreclaimable, drive them out of the fold. That I really believe as I have said, my commentaries and my anti-Arian writings will show. To sum up all—‘if any one does not confess the Virgin to be Theotocos, or calls Christ a mere man, or divides the one Only-begotten into two Sons, let him fall from his hope in Christ, and let all the people say, Amen, Amen.’”

In the following abstract of the argument of the three Dialogues, the actual words, when specially interesting or important, are given between inverted commas.

### *DIALOGUE I. “IMMUTABILIS.”*

Orthodox. “It were better for us to be of one mind: but since you bring forward new opinions, let us amicably inquire into the truth.”

Eranistes. I need no inquiry, for I hold the truth.

O. So say heretics and Pagans. But let us not be enslaved to pre-conception, but discuss the question on purely Scriptural grounds. This is to keep the straight road. Now first as to “essence, hypostases, persons, properties;” “do we say that there is one essence of God the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, according to Scripture and the Nicene Council, or do we follow the blasphemy of Arius?

E. We confess one essence of the Holy Trinity.

O. Is hypostasis different from, or synonymous with, essence?

E. Is there any difference between them?

O. Well, secular philosophy identifies it with essence<sup>h</sup>: essence being what “is,” hypostasis what “subsists.” But according to the

<sup>h</sup> “The whole school of secular learning understands by hypostasis nothing else than *usia*.” So says Jerome, Epist. 15. 4; cf. Newman, Athan. Treatises, i. 70. See S. Athanasius, ad Afros 4. Theodoret seems to be following S. Basil, who says expressly that “hypostasis is not the general notion of essence, but that

which indicates and circumscribes what is general and uncircumscribed in anything by means of manifest properties,” so that in regard to the Trinity it means that which distinguishes the Father from the Son, &c. Epist. 38. cp. Epist. 214. 4: 236. 6. Similarly S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 42. 16.

Fathers<sup>i</sup>, hypostasis is to essence as the particular to the general, as species to genus. Hence hypostasis, in regard to the Trinity, means Person<sup>k</sup>,—Father, Son, or Spirit. So what is predicated of the Divine nature, as the names of God, Lord, Almighty, is common to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. But names denoting Persons belong to the Persons respectively, as Father and Unbegotten—Son, and Word—Holy Spirit and Paraclete.

E. Is not the name Spirit sometimes given in Scripture to the Father or the Son?

O. Yes, to show that the Divine Nature is incorporeal, and unencircumscribed. But the phrase Holy Spirit means the Person of the Spirit. Does the word “Immutable,” then, belong specifically to some one Person, or to the Divine Essence?

E. It is common to the Trinity.

O. Well said; for as mortality is common to men, so is immutability to the Trinity<sup>l</sup>: the Son, then, is immutable.

E. He is so.

O. Why then do you interpret “the Word became flesh” as meaning that the immutable Nature was changed<sup>m</sup>?

E. I do not say that He became flesh by way of change, but in some way known to Him.

O. If you say that He did not become flesh by taking flesh,—one of two things follows: either God was changed into flesh, or His appearance in flesh was merely Docetic<sup>n</sup>.

E. We merely say, He was incarnate.

O. How “incarnate?” Explain “became.”

E. He endured change into flesh, and became flesh. All is possible to Him. He changed the Nile-waters into blood, &c.

O. Yes, creatures are changed as He wills. But He cannot Mal. 3, 6. change; He says, “I change not.”

E. We must not pry into what is hidden<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>i</sup> See on the Tome, c. 4.

<sup>k</sup> Τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὴν ἰδίατητα.

<sup>l</sup> The original is cited by Hooker in note to v. 54, 4, where he says, “This admirable union of God with man can enforce in that higher nature no alteration,” &c.

<sup>m</sup> See Leo, Epist. 1, 65, that “the nature of the Only-begotten is the nature of the Father, is the nature of the Holy Spirit, and the undivided unity and consubstantial equality of the everlasting Trinity is alike impassible, alike immutable.” He adds that if an Eutychian so far departs from Apollinarianism as not to assert

the possibility of Godhead, and yet asserts the nature of the Word and of the flesh to be one, he lapses into Valentinian and Manichean Docetism.

<sup>n</sup> Δοκήσει, cf. Ath. Epist. 7, &c. All notions of any change are disowned by Cyril, Explan. 5, adv. Orient. 1, and see above, p. 50.

<sup>o</sup> He quotes this text in the same sense, Epist. 144. So Ath. Epist. 5, So S. Basil, Epist. 262.

<sup>p</sup> Eutyches, when questioned by the envoys of Flavian’s synod in 448, said that he would not “speculate about the nature of his God,” Mansi, vi. 728.

O. Nor ignore what has been manifested.

E. I know not how the Incarnation took place. I do know that “the Word became flesh.”

O. Yes, but was it by change from what He was? If so, He did not continue to be what He had been: as sand, in contact with fire, becomes first fluid, then glass,—and is sand no more; as grapes cease to be grapes when made into wine; and wine to be wine, when changed into vinegar.

E. Yes: it is just so.

O. Is it thus, then, that He became flesh? If so, the change is indeed vast: He cannot, of course, be God any more.

E. I said before, it is not by way of change: He continued what He was<sup>q</sup>, and became what He was not.

O. But “became” implies change if not explained to mean, He took flesh<sup>r</sup>.

E. “He took” is your invention. The text has it not<sup>s</sup>.

O. Did the same Spirit speak by the Apostles, as Paul, and by the Evangelists?

E. Certainly.

O. Paul, then, may interpret the Gospel: and he says, Christ

<sup>q</sup> See above, p. 118. Athanasius, in *Orat. ii. 47*, explains “became flesh” to mean, not that the whole Word Himself is flesh, but that “He put on flesh and became man.”

<sup>r</sup> “Strictly speaking, one thing becomes another by being changed into that thing which before was not;” [as in the case of the water which became wine.] “It is a contradiction that a thing should become a pre-existing thing.” Dr. Pusey on *Doctr. of Real Presence*, p. 232. See Cyril, *Quod unus sit Christus* (Pusey, p. 339.) It is objected by A. in that dialogue, that if the Word became flesh, He no longer remained Word. B. answers, That is senseless! “Became” does not signify change. A. rejoins, Yes, it does, as when Lot’s wife became a pillar of salt. But, says A. what if the Lord “became my refuge?” Surely when “became” is spoken of in regard to God, it must be understood consistently with this unchangeableness. And Theodoret says in *Demonstr. I. 5.* that the “tabernacle” was the flesh itself: but if He became flesh in the sense of being changed into it, He did not make His tabernacle in flesh.

The words “dwelt among us” remove all obscurity from “became flesh.” Exactly what Cyril had said in *Adv. Orient. 4*: and see Ephraim of Antioch, in Photius, no. 229, (p. 256. Bekker) against those who explained away the phrase “became flesh.” Compare Proclus, in his *Tome to the Armenians*, A.D. 435, “Every thing that ‘becomes’ either comes into being out of nothing, as the heaven did . . . or is changed from what it was before, as the Nile-stream was changed from water into blood. But both these modes are inapplicable to the Divine nature, . . . therefore . . . Scripture said ‘became,’ and often used the word ‘took,’ in order to signify by the former the oneness of the Person, and by the other the unchangeableness of the nature,” alluding to Phil. 2.7. So too S. Chrysostom in *Joan. Hom. 11. 2*: “He added, ‘He dwelt among us;’ as if to say, Do not infer any thing absurd from ‘became’ . . . One thing dwells in another.”

<sup>s</sup> Cyril had expressly used this phrase in *Ep. ad Nest. 3.3*, “Having taken flesh from the Holy Virgin. . .”

Heb. 2. "took hold of the seed of Abraham<sup>1.</sup>" Now, had not the seed of Abraham what Abraham had by nature?

1 S. Pet. 2. 22. E. Not altogether; Christ "did no sin."

O. "Sin does not belong to nature,—but to our evil choice<sup>2.</sup>" I said, "of what Abraham had by nature," and that is, both body and rational soul. Deny this, and you fall into Apollinarianism. But again; Israelites, you will grant, have souls and bodies; and when Isaiah says, "Thou, Israel,—the seed of Abraham," we think of the Jews not as consisting merely of flesh, but as men composed of souls and bodies, and of "Abraham's seed" as not soulless nor mindless, but as having all that characterises Abraham's nature.

E. "To say this is to assert two Sons."

O. "To say that the Word was changed into flesh, is to assert *no* Son. I confess one Son<sup>3.</sup>, who took hold of Abraham's seed."

E. Then Paul and John cannot be made consistent with each other.

O. You think so, because you do not understand, or because you are contentious. The two texts are quite consistent. The Word became flesh, not by being changed, but by taking hold of the seed

<sup>1.</sup> Theod. Epist. 104; "Divine Scripture says that He became man, not by a change in His Godhead, but by the assumption of the human nature from the seed of Abraham." Epist. 116, "because the form of a servant was assumed from the seed of Abraham and David." Epist. 125, "He took hold of Abraham's seed, He was not changed into it." Epist. 130, that He was both "seed of Abraham and Maker of Abraham." Compare S. Ath. Ep. Epict. 5. Cyril refers to the same text in adv. Nest. i. 1. Explan. 1. In adv. Theod. 3, he explains it by "appropriating the limitations of humanity." Observe how Theodoret, like Cyril, confidently quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews as S. Paul's. Compare p. 30.

<sup>2.</sup> See Athan. c. Apollin. 4, 15.

<sup>3.</sup> Here as elsewhere he is careful to disclaim the notion of "two Sons," as by no means involved in the distinctness of the Manhood. See Dial. ii, and the tract, "That even after the Incarnation, our Lord . . . is one Son," (Schulze, iv. 1307.) And see Epist. 83, "I exclude from the portion of Christ's friends those who divide our one Lord into two Persons, two Sons. Let him who parts the one Only-begotten into two Sons fall from his hope in Christ." Epist. 101; "We know the distinction between

Godhead and Manhood: but we acknowledge one Son, God the Word, who became Man at the end of the days." Epist. 101; "We adore our Lord Jesus Christ even after the Incarnation as one Son of God." (This is in fact what Cyril meant by his *μία φύσις*). Epist. 109; "They seem to me impious, who either part our one Lord . . . into two Sons, or who call Christ's Godhead and His Manhood one nature." Epist. 116; I know not the Son of man as one, and the Son of God as another: but the same, Son of God, and God begotten of God, and Son of man," &c. Epist. 125; (to six magistrates;) "Our Lord Jesus Christ, one Son even after He became Man." Epist. 130; "Although we recognize the diversity of the natures, we are bound to adore the one Son . . . the same Son of God and Son of Man," &c. In Epist. 143, he "does not think that there are any persons who actually divide the Son, the Incarnate, into two." Epist. 145; "Because I confess the two natures of Christ, they say that I assert two Sons . . . I do not say two Sons," &c. So at Chalcedon, after the letter of Cyril to John was read, Theodoret anathematised any one who said two Sons, "for we adore one Son, one Lord," &c. Mansi, vi. 673. See above, p. 60.

of Abraham. You remember the promise, “In thy seed shall all Gen. 12. nations be blessed ;” it was reaffirmed to Isaac and Jacob. 3.

E. Yes, I remember.

O. And that seed “was Christ.” Remember also the text, “There Gal. 3. shall not fail a prince from Judah.” . . . Was not that fulfilled in 16. Gen. 49. Christ ? 10.

E. Yes: “Jews misinterpret such prophecies ; but I, as a Christian, unhesitatingly take them as referring to our Saviour.”

O. See then how Paul exhibits the fulfilment of the old promises, as if to say, “God has kept His word ;—by assuming Abraham’s seed (and not Angels), He confirms the ‘expectation of the nations.’” Paul also says, that “our Lord sprang out of Judah,” and this fact, Heb. 7. recorded by Matthew, had been foretold by Micah, whose words 14. the Jews garbled while quoting them to Herod, by omitting, “And Mic. 5. 2. his goings forth,” &c.

E. You do well to quote the whole passage: Micah “does shew that He who was born in Bethlehem was God.”

O. “Not God only, but Man too :” Man, as born there,—God, as existing before the ages : “a Leader,”—as Man, and “going forth from eternity,” as God. So Paul calls Him both Christ sprung Rom. 9. from the Jews as Man, and “God blessed for ever,” Maker and 5. Lord of all things as God <sup>z</sup>.

E. But Jeremiah calls Him God simply, “This is our God . . . Baruch He was seen on earth, and lived among men<sup>a</sup>. Not a word about 3. 35, 37. flesh, or manhood, or man.

O. “What is the use of arguments ? Do we not believe that the Divine nature is invisible ?”

E. Unquestionably.

O. How then could It be seen without a body ? Does not Paul 1 Tim. 1. say, “whom no man hath seen nor can see ?” 17.

E. You cite an apostle against a prophet. Does the prophet speak falsely ?

O. No, both expressions are from the same Spirit.

E. Then let us consider how the Invisible was seen.

<sup>a</sup> This need not, says Dr. Mill, (on *Myth. Interpret. of the Gospels*, p. 321.) be ascribed to “malignity.”

<sup>z</sup> Quoted also in Theod. Epist. 83. (to *Dioscorus*) and in Epist. 146, and 151, to prove the Divinity of Christ. See above, p. 58: and see the elaborate comment at the close of Proclus’s *Tome*, Mansi, v. 436. “He called Him ‘Christ,’ . . . he called Him ‘of Jews according to flesh’ . . .

He called Him ‘who is’ . . . He called Him ‘God’ . . . He called Him ‘blessed’ . . . He called Him ‘for ever.’ Since then we have Christ, and one who is God, and blessed, let us adore Him,” &c.

<sup>b</sup> A confusion between Jeremiah and Barneh, which he again makes in Epist. 151. So Ambrose, *de Fide*, i. 28. Athanasius cites the text correctly in *Orat. c. Ari.* ii. 49.

O. "Do not give *me* your human reasonings<sup>b</sup>; I follow Scripture alone."

E. If you can solve the difficulty by Scriptures, I shall acquiesce.

O. Well: I quoted Paul as to the true sense of John (1. 14.) I now quote him as to how God was seen on earth. "God<sup>c</sup> was manifested in flesh," &c. His acts through the flesh revealed His power, and even the Angels beheld Him through that medium.

S. Matt. 18. 10. E. But they "always behold God's face."

O. They are said to see God as men are said to have seen Him; Abraham, Moses, Isaiah, and other prophets, who yet never saw His Exod. 33. very Self, but only what it was possible for them to see.

20. E. You mean that "the benignant Lord measures His revelations by the capacity of the beholders?"

Hos. 12. 10. O. Just so. God is shown by "resemblances," by media of representation.

E. This is not clear: do you mean that those favoured persons who "saw God" did not see His essence?

(S. John 1. 16.) O. Undoubtedly. What they saw was not His nature, but "certain visions adapted to their capacity." So with Angels; not even they can behold "that Divine Essence, which is uncircumscribed, uncomprehended, inconceivable: they only see a certain glory adapted to their own nature." But when God became Incarnate, then they saw Him in "real living flesh," which was like a veil.

E. "Veil" is a novelty in language.

Heb. 10. O. You cannot have read Scripture with due care: Paul expressly calls Christ's flesh a veil.<sup>d</sup>

20. E. That is decisive.

Gen. 49. 10. O. "Then do not charge me with novelties." Again, the prophecy about Judah refers to Christ's flesh as a garment. "He shall wash his garment in wine, and his mantle in the blood of the grape."

E. The patriarch was speaking of clothes, not of a body.

O. Did He then ever wash His clothes in wine?

E. Did He ever so wash His body?

O. Speak, I beg, with more reserve. There may be some present who are uninitiated<sup>e</sup>.—Did He not call Himself a "vine?" is not

S. John 15. 1. <sup>b</sup> A sort of retort, see above. The Eutychians professed to distrust speculations, and to cling to this or that text, or this or that dictum of a Father. See an important note (by Dr. Newman) in Oxf. Transl. of Fleury, vol. iii. p. 340. "Orthodox" means, "It is my turn to protest against 'human reasonings' on your side."

<sup>c</sup> Theodoret, therefore, read οὐδὲν.

not οὐδὲν. But Cyril evidently read οὐδὲν, Expl. 2; de recta fide ad Theod. c. 7. Schol. 10. See Hammond, Textual Criticism of N. T. p. 106.

<sup>d</sup> See Newman's note in Athan. Treatises ii. 291; and Tracts Theol. and Eccles. p. 267.

<sup>e</sup> Μυστικῶτερον. A hint of the "Disciplina Arcani" (for which, see Newman's Arians, p. 51.) See allusion

the fruit of the vine made into "wine?" Did not blood and water flow from His side? Here then was a fulfilment of the prophecy; the "garment," that is, His body, was "washed in the blood of the grape," that is, the blood of Christ the true Vine, which flowed from that body on the cross. For as we call the sacramental<sup>f</sup> fruit of the vine, after its consecration, "the Lord's blood," so the blood of the true Vine was called 'the blood of the grape.'

E. You have given an interpretation both mystical and clear.

O. Now, another proof: God<sup>g</sup>, you know, called His own Body "bread." Did He not elsewhere, call His flesh "corn?"

E. Yes: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die," <sup>S. John 12. 24.</sup>

O. But in the institution of the Mysteries, He called the bread "body," and the mixed drink<sup>h</sup> "blood;" whereas, naturally, His body would be called "body," and His blood "blood."

E. Unquestionably.

O. But our Saviour changed the names, and gave to His body the name of the symbol<sup>i</sup>, and to the symbol that of His body. So having called Himself a "vine," He called the symbol "blood."

E. True: and why did He make this change?

O. The initiated understand that it was because "He desired the communicants not to attend to the nature of what they saw, but by means of the change of names to believe in the change effected by grace. For He who called that which is by nature body 'bread,' and called Himself a 'vine,' honoured the visible symbols with the title of 'body and blood,' not having changed their nature, but added grace to their nature<sup>k</sup>. Now, of what is that most holy food a symbol? Of the Deity of Christ, or of His Body and Blood?"

E. Doubtless, the latter.

O. Spoken like a lover of truth. Christ, in taking the symbol, said not "This is My Godhead," but "This is My Body!" Then He had a body?

to it even in the Church-historian Sozomen, with reference to "the mysteries," viii. 5, and still more strikingly when he tells us that he had been dissuaded by pious friends from inserting the Nicene Creed into his work, because such matters were only for "initiated and initiators,"<sup>i. 20.</sup>

<sup>f</sup> Literally, "mystical." Cp. Serm. Major, 36, to the same effect that the garment means Christ's body, and wine His blood; and that He called wine His blood, though it is the blood of the grape.

<sup>g</sup> This is clearly anti-Nestorian lan-

guage. Compare the Athanasian phrase, "God's body," &c. p. 64.

<sup>h</sup> Compare S. Justin M. Apol. i. 65. S. Irenaeus v. 2. 3. on the "mixture."

<sup>i</sup> Here Theodoret means, our Lord called His own body bread, (as He called Himself a vine) and called bread His body, in order to fix attention on the sacramental as distinct from the natural character of the bread.

<sup>k</sup> See a similar passage in Dial. ii. which states more fully what Theodoret believed as to the Eucharist.

<sup>l</sup> Here he is adopting an expression of Nestorius: Cyril adv. Nest. iv. 6

E. "Well, I call Him bodiless<sup>m</sup>. I say the Word became flesh."

O. Truly, I am "filling a cask that has holes." After all our argument, back you come to the same point! You quote the Evangelist's phrase: but I interpret it by Paul's, e. g. "Every high priest"—&c. And he distinctly says that Christ, as a Priest, had "a body prepared for Him to offer." He does not say "Thou hast changed me into a body." And this body, Matthew teaches, was formed by the Spirit.

E. Therefore what was born of Mary was a body only.

O. You do not even observe the wording, far less the meaning. The reference is to conception not to birth. Well, I have shown how Paul interprets the Psalmist: Christ as man is a Priest; as a Priest, He had to offer a sacrifice; He could not offer anything but His own body; therefore He had a body.

E. I cannot admit that He assumed a body.

O. As far as I see, this is the old error of Gnostics<sup>n</sup> and Manicheans<sup>o</sup> or worse, for they never said that the immutable nature was changed into flesh.

E. Abuse is not Christianlike.

O. "I am not dealing in abuse: I am contending for truth, and am sorry that you dispute about what is beyond all doubt." But you remember in a Psalm, written with prophetic foresight of the captivity, and full confidence in those promises which spoke of a "seed of Ps. 89.4. David," who was to be "established for ever."

E. This referred to Solomon.

O. Was Solomon, then, the "seed" spoken of to the patriarchs? Was it in him that "all nations" were "blessed?"

E. Then to Zerubbabel<sup>o</sup>.

O. You go from one extreme to another—from Gnosticism to the Jewish "faction;" like all who leave the right path, you wander hither and thither.

<sup>m</sup> Cp. Ath. c. Apollin. i. 10: the Apollinarians "wished to suppress the word body." Theodoret, in Epist. 130, quotes the reference to the "body of Jesus" in the Gospel narrative of the burial.

<sup>n</sup> E.g. "who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, &c. See Theod. Epist. 82; and again Epist. 125, that since the Godhead is impassible, Christ must have had a human nature which could suffer: otherwise "there would be  $\delta\delta\kappa\eta\sigma\tau\alpha$  instead of reality, and the great mystery of the economy would be seen to be  $\varphi\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha$ . This myth was produced

by Valentinus and Bardesanes, and Marcion, and Manes." See also Ath. Ep. Epict. 7. c. Apollin. i. 3. 12; ii. 3.

<sup>o</sup> It is curious to see Theodoret here ascribing to Eranistes that same disposition to minimise the Messianic element in the Psalms and Prophets which was one of the offensive features in Theodore's system of interpretation. "Omnis psalmos," says Leontius of Theodore, "Judaicè ad Zorobabelm et Ezechiam retulit, tribus tantum ad Dominum rejectis." Galland, xii. 687. Here Theodoret differs widely from Theodore. See his "Prefatio in Psalmos."

E. "Railers" have no part in God's kingdom.

O. But Paul on occasion used severe language. And I may well use it, when you are advocating the Jewish negation of the Messianic sense of these prophecies<sup>o</sup>, and applying them to men who died and passed away, as the whole Davidic line has done.

E. Are the Jewish so-called "patriarchs" of David's lineage?

O. No,—of Herod's; but even they are gone; their government passed away long ago<sup>p</sup>: whereas the prophecy spoke of One who should reign for ever,—that One being sprung from David. Yet we know that God cannot lie. How then, in the face of facts, can we prove that He has kept His word to David?

E. The prophecy must refer to Christ.

O. Very well: now observe, in the middle portion of the psalm it is said of this great King, the Son of David, "I will make His throne to be as the days of heaven, &c.

E. None but Christ can be the subject of this promise<sup>q</sup>.

O. Then, if the promise cannot fail, and the Jews have no Davidic kingdom left, Christ, as Man, is the seed of David.

E. I admit it.

O. Then His Manhood is proved. See too the words "I have set Isa. 55. Him for a Leader to the nations," and the other passage, "A rod<sup>4</sup> Ib. 11. 1. from the root of Jesse."

E. I take that of Zerubbabel.

O. Even the Jews did not so take it<sup>r</sup>! The context suits no mere man; for *all* the powers of the Spirit rest on the Person intended. And at the same time, the context indicates Him as really man, exercising judgment. So that part of the prediction relates to humanity, part to Divinity. The passage also points to a general union of all classes under His rule, men of diverse characters in one faith; and this is fulfilled in our experience, for Christians of all classes, the Sovereigns of the world inclusive, have one "bath," one teaching, one mystical Table, the same portion as believers. It shows too that He is not God only, but also Man, a "rod from the root of Jesse."

E. Did the apostles own Christ to be of David's seed?

O. Yes, Peter did; His testimony would suffice, for the confession

<sup>p</sup> See Cod. Theod. xvi. 8. 29. Gothofred dates the extinction of this patriarchate between 415 and 429. Cp. Milman's Hist. Jews, iii. 37.

<sup>q</sup> See Leo, Epist. 30. "It is of no use to call our Lord, the Son of the Blessed Virgin, 'Man,' if we do not believe Him to be Man of that race

and seed to which He is said, in the very beginning of the Gospel, to belong."

<sup>r</sup> "The reference" of Isa. 11. 1 ff. "to the Messiah is plainly affirmed in the Targum of Jonathan." Pye Smith, Script. Testim. to Messiah, i. 259.

uttered by him alone called forth Christ's approval. But Paul says  
 Acts 13. the same in several passages. The distinction taken, "according  
 23. to the flesh," shows that Christ was not man only, but God before  
 2 Tim. 2. 8. the ages<sup>3</sup>.

Rom. 1. 1—3. E. Still, I hold by "The Word became flesh."

O. So do I,—in its right meaning. If the Word took nothing  
 from our nature, God's promises are falsified, the prophecies have  
 failed; the Nativity is unreal<sup>4</sup>; our faith is vain; the Resurrection  
 has not "raised us up to heavenly places." The Evangelist interprets  
 Phil. 2. 4 ff. himself. The context proves that the Word did take our nature,  
 remaining immutably God's only Son. Compare Paul's words,  
 "Who being in the form of God," &c; it is a parallel passage.  
 Both of them teach that He Who was God assumed human nature  
 for our salvation. Not Jews only, but His own disciples spoke of  
 Him as Man.

E. I see all this. But explain how He was made "in the likeness of men."

O. What He took was not the likeness, but the nature of man: "form," in either case, means nature<sup>5</sup>. "Likeness of men" means that while He was God, He appeared to be man.

E. How did the Fathers understand John's words?

O. Scripture ought to suffice. But I will give quotations: (quotes Athanasius to Epictetus, c. 8. &c. Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, Flavian of Antioch, Gelasius of Cæsarea, Chrysostom:—) I would add Diodore and Theodore, but that you are prejudiced against them<sup>6</sup>. But take Ignatius<sup>7</sup>, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Methodius, Eustathius of Antioch, Athanasius, (de Sent. Dionysii 10, 12: Serm. Major de Fide 3, 36, 1: Ep. to Epict. 2, 7:) Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Amphilius.

E. The Eastern authors quoted agree with the Western. But I see that they make a broad "division."

O. You should not insult men of whom some actually listened to, and knew, the Apostles. But I will give you quotations from the author of your own heresy, Apollinaris<sup>8</sup>; in his "Compendium" he distinctly says, Christ was not changed into flesh, but became

<sup>3</sup> Compare c. Apollin. i. 13, 20.

<sup>4</sup> Literally, "The Virgin is superfluous" (a phrase borrowed from Ath. Ep. Epict. 4,) in that she offered to the Incarnate God nothing of our nature." Cf. S. Basil, Ep. 261.

<sup>5</sup> On this see above, p. 116.

<sup>6</sup> So in Epist. 16, in 149, he explains to bishop Irenæus why he is refraining from quoting those wri-

ters, although for his part he had written in their defence.

<sup>7</sup> He refers to Ignatius as having been consecrated by the right hand of Peter, Ep. 151. These quotations are important in the Ignatian controversy, Ep. Ignat. Smyrn. 1: Eph. 18, 7. Trall. 9.

<sup>8</sup> See his Hist. v. 3, as to the "root" of Monophysitism.

flesh in a “nobler” way, in that He took to Himself flesh, and became one with it “by composition.” Elsewhere he denies any “alteration, translation, or inclusion of the holy Power of God;” he says, “We adore God,—who assumed flesh from the Virgin, and therefore is God according to the Spirit, Man according to flesh;” and in another work, “We confess that the Son of God was made Son of Man, not nominally but really, having assumed flesh from Mary.”

E. I did not know that Apollinaris said this.

O. But now you see that even Apollinaris repeatedly disowned the notion that the Word was changed into flesh; and “the disciple is not above his master.”

E. I admit that the Word is Immutable, and that He assumed flesh. Let us go on to the next subject to-morrow.

O. Yes,—and think over the points on which we are now agreed.

## *DIALOGUE II. “INCONFUSUS.”*

E. Here am I, according to promise; and you must either answer my questions, or assent to what I say.

O. I accept your challenge. But first let us recollect the point at which we left off, and what our discussion tends to.

E. We agreed that the Word remained immutable, and took flesh, but was not changed into flesh.

O. You state the case like a lover of truth.

E. As I said before, it would be absurd to differ from such eminent teachers. But then I was much impressed by your quotations from Apollinaris, although in his work “on the Incarnation” he took a wholly different line. Therefore I agree with you that the Lord took flesh.

O. Well,—what flesh? Body and soul, you will own. But what soul? the rational, or the vital and animal? For Apollinaris makes that distinction; he says that man is composed of body, and vital soul, and mind. But Scripture recognises only one soul<sup>a</sup>. S. Luke

E. You have proved that each man has but one soul.

12. 4, 5; Gen. 46.

O. Apollinaris says, two: and that the Word assumed the irrational, but was Himself instead of the rational; which soul then do Acts 20. 10. you think He assumed?

<sup>a</sup> See Theod. Epist. 145, that Apollinaris took his distinction between  $\psi\nu\chi\nu$  and  $\nu\nu\sigma$  from Pagan philosophy. Compare Liddon, Some Elements of Religion, p. 92. See on c. Apollin. i. 14.

E. Following Scripture, I say, He assumed a reasonable soul.

O. Yes: He took "the form of a servant" in its completeness. For He had to repair the image which was wholly impaired<sup>b</sup>.

E. True. But I want to clear away an ambiguity. Tell me, are we to call Christ "Man?"

O. Both God and Man. "God the Word, having become Man, was called Jesus Christ<sup>c</sup>." Before the Incarnation He was spoken of simply as God, Son of God, the Word, Life, Light. But after the Incarnation He was called Jesus and Christ.

E. Then, since He became Man, without being changed, but remaining what He was, we must call Him simply what He was, God.

O. "God the Word was, and is, and will be, immutable: but He became Man by taking human nature. We ought therefore to acknowledge both natures, that which took and that which was taken."

E. "We ought to name Him from His higher element."

O. Is man, as a living being, simple or compound?

E. Compound, of body and soul.

O. Which is the superior of these natures?

E. Soul.

O. Man, then, should be called from his higher nature.

Gen. 46. E. So he is; e. g. "Israel went unto Egypt with 75 souls." Here 27, LXX. the men are called souls<sup>d</sup>. Elsewhere we read, "My Spirit shall not Ib. 6. 3, LXX. always abide in these men, because they are flesh," meaning sensual.

O. Is man never called "flesh" except in an invidious sense?

Gal. 1. Think of Paul,—"I conferred not with flesh and blood," explained by, 16, 17. "the apostles." And "to Thee shall all flesh come;" whereas some Ps. 65. 2. times man is called "soul" when censured, as, "The soul that sineth, it shall die." This proves that where two elements are combined by an union of two natures, the composite whole may be named after the lower as well as after the higher element.

E. "But what compels you to call our Saviour 'Man?'"

O. The opposite heresies, Arian and Sabellian. "The former divides the essence<sup>e</sup>, the latter confounds the persons." Must not different diseases be cured by different treatment?

<sup>b</sup> Comp. Ath. c. Apollin. i. 7. On thus retracing the effaced colours of the picture, see *de Incarn. Verbi* 14.

<sup>c</sup> Here is the essence of what S. Cyril had contended for.

<sup>d</sup> See Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, 78; Gregory Nazianzen, *Epist.* 101. Cyril Alex. says, *Schol.* 27, that Scripture sometimes describes man by one part of his being, sometimes by another, as S. Luke 3. 6 and Deut. 10. 22. He

interprets "became flesh" as = "became Man."

<sup>e</sup> The Encyphians feared that to call Christ Man might be equivalent to calling him a Man, a human person. See above p. 97, 152.

<sup>f</sup> Literally, "essences." Of course this plural does not mean that there are two essences of the Father and the Son, as there are, in the next clause, distinct hypostases.

E. Yes.

O. We have then to persuade the Arian, that there is one Essence in God, and the Sabellian, that there are three Persons,—by different phrases.

E. Yes: but are we not wandering from our point?

O. No: you will soon see that we have been gathering materials for its decision. Have all heresies owned both the Godhead and Manhood of Christ?

E. No: some, one only; some the other.

O. And some have acknowledged a part of His humanity.

E. Yes; but tell me the names of the sects to which you allude.

O. Simon and Menander, &c. have denied Christ's humanity: Artemon, Theodotus, Paul of Samosata, &c. His Divinity. Arius<sup>g</sup> and Eunomius denied Him an animal soul: Apollinaris, a mind. Now, must we let these men rush down a precipice, without trying to rescue them?

E. No, it would be inhuman.

O. And various diseases<sup>h</sup> must be dealt with variously; and different plants need various training. So, different errors must be differently treated. What then must be prescribed for the Photinians or Marcellians?

E. Belief in Christ's Divinity.

O. Then we need not speak to them of His Manhood?

E. No.

O. And in treating of the Incarnation with Arians, or Eunomians, what must we add to their belief?

E. That Christ assumed a soul.

O. And what must be supplied to an Apollinarian?

E. That He assumed a rational soul,—that the rational soul is not separate from the animal.

O. Gnostics too and Manicheans,—what do they believe and what deny?

E. They tell us they believe in Christ's Divinity, but not in His Humanity.

O. So then, we shall have to persuade them to accept the doctrine of His Humanity, and not to call the Divine economy illusory<sup>i</sup>.

E. That will be our duty.

O. Then we shall tell them that they ought to call Christ not God only, but "Man."

<sup>g</sup> A mistake as to Arius, see Newman, *Tracts Theol.* and *Eccles.* p. 258.

<sup>h</sup> He enumerates as diseases, suffusion of eyes, toothache, straining of

muscles, bile, &c.

<sup>i</sup> Καὶ μὴ φανταστῶν τὴν θείαν οἰκονομίαν καλέεν. Cf. Ath. Ep. Epict. 7. e. Apollin. i. 3.

E. Just so.

O. Indeed! but how can we bid them call Him "Man," if we ourselves decline to call Him so? They will convict us of inconsistency.

E. We do not agree with them: for we own that the Word assumed flesh and a rational soul.

O. "If we confess the thing, why avoid the name?"

E. "Christ ought to be named from what is "more honourable."

O. Follow that out, and, you will give up calling Him "crucified" and "risen."

E. No: for those words refer to His Passion, to deny which would be to annul our salvation.

O. The name "Man" is a name of nature: therefore to suppress it is to deny nature,—therefore, to deny the Passion,—therefore, to annul our salvation.

E. "I deem it important to recognise the nature which He assumed. But to call the Saviour 'Man' is to impair the Lord's glory."<sup>k</sup>

S. John 8. 40.  
Acts 2. 22.  
Ib. 30. 31.

O. Are you then wiser than the Saviour Himself, who called Himself a man, or than Peter and Paul who so spoke of Him?

E. Those sayings were uttered to men who did not believe. Now the largest part of the world has believed.

O. Still there are Jews, Pagans, and countless heretics, and they must all be approached with teaching which will suit their cases. But, waiving that, tell me what harm is done by calling Christ "God and Man?" Is not Manhood, equally with Godhead, perfect in Him?

E. It is. I have often said so. But "to call Him 'Man' is, I think, superfluous, especially when Christians converse together."

1 Tim. 2. 5.

O. Paul and Timothy were Christians, and Paul calls Christ "Man" in a passage where also the very name "Mediator" implies that He is Man as well as God<sup>l</sup>. He is Mediator, because, as God, He is conjoined to the Father as having the same essence,—and, as Man, to us, for He assumed from us the form of a servant.

Gal. 3. 19.

E. Was not Moses called "a mediator?"

O. He was a type of *the* Mediator, but no type comes up to the reality. He was not by nature God, but he was "appointed as a god to Pharaoh."

<sup>k</sup> See this quoted in Newman's *Athan. Treat.* ii. 148, ed. 2. A sort of will-worship or misdirected reverence is here indicated as the motive of Eutychians. Eutyches himself would call Christ man, but (on a like pretext) "refused to admit His hu-

man nature," Newman, i.e.

<sup>l</sup> So Theod. *in loc.* The doctrine of the Mediator is set forth in S. Irenaeus, iii. 18, and S. Augustine *de Civ. Dei*, ix. 15, and *Sermons* 240 and 293. Compare Wilberforce on the Incarnation, e. 7, p. 144.

E. But is that a "type" which has not the clear impression<sup>m</sup> of the archetype?

O. The Emperor's images are "types" of the living Emperor; but they lack life and reason, and they only represent the bust<sup>n</sup>. So Moses is a mediator as an image or type, Christ is a Mediator as the reality. But remember how Melchisedec is treated of in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and compared to Christ.

E. (repeats Heb. 7. 1—19.)

O. You have done well to recite the passage entire. Now does this description belong to Melchisedec in nature<sup>o</sup> and reality?

E. "Who durst separate what Paul has combined?"

O. You mean that the description does apply to Melchisedec in regard to nature. Was he then a man?

E. A man.

O. Begotten or unbegotten?

E. What absurd questions!

O. 'Tis your fault. Answer me.

E. Of course God the Father alone is unbegotten.

O. But Melchisedec was "without father or mother, without beginning or end," &c. How do you understand this?

E. "The passage is very obscure, and greatly needs elucidation."

O. Paul means that "in points which exceed human nature Christ is the archetype of Melchisedec." Consider the points of resemblance. Had Christ a father according to the flesh?

E. Certainly not.

O. Had He a mother according to the Divine nature?

E. By no means<sup>p</sup>.

O. So He is "without genealogy" in that His Divine generation is inexplicable. So, as God, He has neither beginning nor end.

E. I agree to this. But how, then, does that language apply to Melchisedec?

O. To him as to a type; to Christ in strict reality. Melchisedec is said to have no genealogy, because Scripture does not give his pedigree.

E. So as to his parentage.

O. Yes, these particulars, according to the economy of Scripture, belong to him as a type.

E. "An image ought to represent the archetype."

<sup>m</sup> Χαρακτῆρας. Cf. Heb. i. 3.

<sup>p</sup> See Theodoret, "Quod . . . unicus

<sup>n</sup> See Athan. Orat. c. Ari. iii. 5. Athan. Treatises, ii. 175, ed. 2.

Filius sit" (Schulze, iv. 1311.) "He

<sup>o</sup> So Athanasius and Cyril both use φύσει for "in reality." Cp. p. 96.

is without father in regard to His Manhood, . . . and is without mother as God."

1 Cor.  
11. 7.

O. Does not Paul call man an “image of God?” On your showing, then, man ought to be uncreate, uncircumscribed, incomposite: to create, to make all things at a word, not to be ill or in pain, or angry,—nor to sin, &c.

E. Man is not God’s image in all points.

O. But in whatever points he is, he will be found to come short of the reality.

E. I grant it.

Col. 1.  
15.  
S. John  
16. 14.

O. Paul calls the Son “the Image of the Invisible God.”

E. What? has not the Son all that the Father has?

O. He is not Father, not uncaused, not unbegotten<sup>9</sup>.

E. If He were, He would not be Son.

O. So then it is true; an image has not all that the archetype has.

E. It is true.

O. In this way, then, is Melchisedec said to have been “made like unto the Son of God.”

E. Granting other points, how shall we understand his “not having beginning of days,” &c.?

O. Scripture does not tell us when he was begotten or born, or when he died. The Son of God, in very truth, neither began to be, nor will cease to be. So, in points which really belong to God, Melchisedec was a type of Christ. But in regard to high-priesthood, which belongs to man, he really was a priest of Gentiles; and Christ, made a High-priest after his order, “offered for all men that most holy and saving Sacrifice.”

E. We have had a long discussion about this.

O. And there was room for yet more. You said the passage was difficult to understand.

E. Let us return to our point.

O. Where were we?

1 Tim. 2.  
5.

E. You had cited “The Man Christ Jesus,” in proof that it was right to call Christ not “God” only, but also “Man.”

O. I remember what led us off into this digression. You raised a point as to the word “Mediator.” Well: do you own that we ought to call Christ “Man,” as well as “God?”

E. I call Him “God,” for He is God’s Son.

O. He called Himself God’s Son, and He also called Himself “Man.”

E. The name “Man” does not befit Him so well as “God,” be-

<sup>9</sup> See Athan. de Synod. 49, “what is predicated of the Father is predicated also in Scripture of the Son, excepting only the being called Fa-

ther,” Compare Pearson on the Creed, ii. 43, on this use of the term “cause,” quoting S. Basil, Epist. 38, 4, &c. Cf. S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 23, 7.

cause the name of God belongs to nature, the name of Man to the 'dispensation'.<sup>r</sup>

O. But is that dispensation true, or unreal<sup>s</sup>?

E. It is true.

O. Well then, if it is true, and if it is identical with His becoming man, the name "Man" is a true name for Him. For, having assumed human nature, He was called "Man."

E. Only before His Passion.

O. No, after it also. "By Man came also the Resurrection,"<sup>1 Cor. 15. 21.</sup> meaning, of course, Christ<sup>t</sup>. "Do not let us think ourselves wiser than the great preachers of truth."

E. "I do not so think: but I do not see the need of the name."

O. You must use it in order to convert Marcionites and Manicheans.

E. Perhaps we must, for them.

O. But why not train the faithful in the defence of the truth? Are we not to them as officers to soldiers? Have not they to fight and keep their ranks under our leadership? Moreover, as we said, the physician has to add to nature the quality which it lacks. If he finds heat predominating, he must apply cold. And this was what the Lord did.

E. Where,—how?

O. What did the Jews think Him to be?

E. A man.

O. Then they were quite ignorant that He was also God?

E. Yes.

O. Then it was necessary for them to learn it?

E. Of course.

O. Hear, then, what He said to them; "Many good works have <sup>S. John</sup> I shown you," and the rest of the passage.<sup>10. 32—38.</sup>

E. But there He did not prove Himself to be Man, but God.

O. Because there was no need to prove the former. So too He <sup>S. Matt.</sup> asked the Pharisees, who regarded Him as an ordinary man, how the <sup>22. 42,</sup> Christ, being "Son of David," could be "Lord of David."<sup>19.</sup>

E. This makes against you: He there called Himself not "Son of David," but "Lord of David." This shows which title He prefers<sup>u</sup>.

<sup>r</sup> Τῆς οἰκονομίας. Cf. Athan. Tome, 7.

<sup>s</sup> Φαντασιώδης.

<sup>t</sup> Long before, in the letter to the Euphratesian Monks, (Ep. 151) while fiercely attacking Cyril's Articles, Theodoret had cited texts in which Christ was called man, this among the rest.

<sup>u</sup> See Leo, Epist. 59. 4. "He who does not admit that the Only-begotten Son took our nature in utero Davidice Virginis is alien from the whole mystery of Christian religion;" and Ep. 72, "Be not ashamed of the Gospel of the generation of Jesus Christ, Son of David . . . according to the flesh." But Cyril had said the

O. You do not attend to the passage. He asked, "How is He then His Son?" He did not say, "He is Lord, *not* Son." He asked, "How is He his Son?" as if to say, "In one respect He is Lord, in another He is Son." This proves that He had both the Godhead and the Manhood.

E. "No need of arguments. The Lord distinctly taught that He does not will to be called Son of David."

O. Why then did He not so teach the Canaanitish woman, the blind men, the crowds who sang Hosanna?

E. He tolerated these addresses before His resurrection, accommodating Himself to the weakness of those who did not as yet perfectly believe. But now that He is risen, these names are obsolete.

O. Was Paul one of the perfect, or of the imperfect?

E. "We ought not to joke about serious things."

O. "Nor ought we to despise the reading of the Divine oracles."

E. "Who is so wretched as to neglect his own salvation<sup>x</sup>?"

O. Answer my question as to Paul.

E. Clearly he is a most perfect teacher.

O. When did he begin to preach?

E. After the death of Stephen.

O. And just before his own death he speaks of Christ as "of the 2 Tim. 2. seed of David." I could cite other texts, but I think it would be 8. superfluous.

E. You promised to show that our Lord spoke of His flesh, as you have said He did of His Godhead.

O. The mere existence of His flesh, seen, as eating, toiling, sleeping, was a proof sufficient: but remember what He said after His S. Luke 24. 39. Resurrection, "Behold my hands and my feet<sup>y</sup>," &c. "Now I have fulfilled my promise. Cease to dispute; acknowledge His two Natures."

E. "There were two before the union: but when they came together, they constituted one nature<sup>z</sup>."

O. When did the union take place?

E. At His conception.

O. Was the Word preexistent before the conception?

like, Ep. ad S. 2. that blessed Paul had described the descendant of Abraham, of Jews, of David, as Lord of glory, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Observe the spiritual importance ascribed to the reading of Scripture. So, e. g. S. Athanasius, after enumerating the canonical books, says, "These are fountains of salvation, so that he who thirsts may be satiated with the oracles which they con-

tain," Ep. Fest. 39.

<sup>y</sup> Quoted by Leo, in his Tome, c. 5, and in his second Tome or Epist. 165.

<sup>z</sup> This was the proposition to which Eutyches adhered at the Council of Constantinople in 451. See Mansi, vi. 711; Fleury, b. 27, c. 28. He thought then, as Dioscorus thought at Chalcedon, (Mansi, vi. 684,) that he was holding fast to S. Cyril, e.g. ad S. 2. L. (Epist. p. 137.) But Cyril's con-

E. Yes, before all ages.

O. Was the flesh also preexistent?

E. By no means <sup>a</sup>.

O. It was formed by the Holy Spirit after the Annunciation?

E. So I say.

O. Then there were not "two natures before the union," but only one <sup>b</sup>; only the Godhead, that nature which is eternal, and existed before the ages. Do you distinguish the Incarnation, or the becoming Man, from the union?

E. No.

O. Right: for He became Incarnate by assuming flesh.

E. So it appears.

O. And the assumption involved the union?

E. Yes.

O. Well: if then the union was the becoming Man, and He became Man by taking human nature, and the form of God took the form of a servant, then before the union there was one nature, i. e. the Divine.

E. But is the union the becoming Man?

O. You just now admitted it.

E. "You misled me by your arguments."

O. Well, let us begin the discussion over again. Does the Incarnation differ from the union in the nature of the thing?

E. Very much.

O. Explain more fully, wherein lies the difference.

E. The very names prove it. "Incarnation" means, the assumption of flesh: "union," the conjunction of things that were separated.

O. Is the Incarnation prior to the union?

E. No.

text shows that what he meant was, "The one Son, or Christ, is indivisible after the union." See above, p. 175.

<sup>a</sup> Eranistes disowns this Apollinarian theory, for which see above, p. 80.

<sup>b</sup> "It is as impious," says Leo in his Tome, c. 6, "to say that the Son of God was of two natures before the Incarnation, as it is wicked to assert only one nature after the Word was made flesh." From his Epist. 35 we see that he suspected Eutyches of imagining the soul of Christ to have preexisted in heaven: but apparently Eutyches only meant that the two natures were, in the abstract, conceivable independently of the Incarnation: not that

the human nature of Christ had ever existed apart from His Divine Person. Ephraim of Antioch followed Leo and Theodoret here, (Photius, no. 228, p. 247,) and urged that the flesh had no existence whatever before it was united to the Word, and that to affirm two natures before the union was in effect to Nestorianize. To the objection of the Severians, "A φύσις cannot exist ἀνυπόστατος, therefore to say two φύσεις = "to say two Persons," Ephraim replies, (1) that φύσης is often predicated where personality is out of the question, (2) that in man there is a φύσις of body and a φύσις of soul, but no one would call either body or soul a ὑπόστασις, ib. no. 229, p. 256.

O. The union, then, took place in the conception?

E. Yes.

O. If, then, not a moment intervened between the assumption of flesh and the union, and the assumed nature did not exist before the assumption and union<sup>c</sup>, then there was one nature before the union, that is, the Incarnation, but after the union two<sup>d</sup>.

E. I say that Christ was “from two natures.” But “two natures” ( $\delta\omega\phi\nu\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ ) I do not say<sup>e</sup>.

O. Well, but how is He “from two natures?” Is it like the case of silver gilt? or of the composition of electron? (from gold and silver) or of glue made of lead and tin?

E. No,—the union is ineffable and inconceivable.

O. I also admit that the mode of the union cannot be comprehended. But Scripture has taught us that each nature remains inviolate even after the union<sup>f</sup>.

E. Where does Scripture teach this?

O. Scripture is full of this doctrine.

E. Give me some proof.

O. Do you not then, admit the existence of the properties of each nature?

E. Not after the union.

O. Let us then learn this from Scripture.

E. To Scripture I will submit.

<sup>c</sup> Quoted by Hooker, v. 52, 3, note.

<sup>d</sup> Theodoret, *Demonstr.* 2.1, “Those who believe that after the union one nature of Godhead and Manhood was constituted, destroy by this theory the properties of the natures: and to destroy them is to deny both natures. For the confusion of the united elements forbids us to think of flesh as flesh, or of God as God. But if, even after the union, the difference between these elements is distinguishable, then no confusion has taken place, but the union is without confusion. But if this is granted, the Lord Christ is not one nature, but one Son, exhibiting each nature unimpaired.” At the Council of Constantinople in 448, Florentius, the Patrician, with Flavian and Basil of Selenia, urged Eutyches in vain to admit “two natures after the union.” Basil (by his own account at the “Robbers’ meeting,”) told Eutyches that to assert one nature after the union, without adding to nature the term “incarnate,” was to confound the Godhead of our one Lord with His flesh,

Mansi, vi. 748.

<sup>e</sup> This illustrates the substitution at Chalcedon of “in two natures,” for the inadequate “from two natures.” See Oxf. Transl. of Fleury, vol. iii. p. 373, note. Dioscorus at Chalcedon said tersely, “I accept the ‘from two,’ not the ‘two,’ Mansi, vi. 692. It is observable that in this first session of Chalcedon the profession of the deceased Flavian, that the one Christ was “from two natures” after He became man, had been approved by Leo’s deputies, and by other bishops, Mansi, vi. 680. Yet even at the Council of 448, at which Flavian made this statement, Basil of Selenia and Selenus of Amasia had said “in two natures,” ib. 685.

<sup>f</sup> So Flavian in his 2nd letter to Leo; “Even in the union the properties of the two natures remain entire.” So Leo in the Tome, c. 3, “Each nature retains its own property without defect,” and in Ep. 35, “*Sic assumptam naturam beatificans, ut glorificata in glorificante permaneat.*”

O. John says, "In the beginning was the Word," &c, Do you say this of the flesh, or of the Word, begotten of the Father before all ages ?

E. These expressions refer to the Word. But I do not separate Him from the flesh which was united to Him.

O. "Nor do I separate the flesh from the Word. But neither do I make the union a confusion."

E. I know of one nature after the union <sup>g</sup>.

O. When did the Evangelists write,—before or after the union ?

E. Clearly after it,—after the descent of the Holy Spirit. .

O. Well then,—compare John's words with the opening of Matthew's Gospel. Can you make these sayings fit one nature ? Im-<sup>1. 1.</sup> possible.

E. "When you speak thus, you are dividing the Only-begotten Son into two Persons."

O. "No, I adore one Son <sup>h</sup>, our Lord Jesus : but I have learned the difference between the Godhead and the Manhood. But do you, who say, 'one nature after the union,' try to harmonize this with the prologues of the Gospels. Now both these things, existence in the beginning, and descent as to flesh from Abraham and David, belong to Christ the Lord."

E. Take care ! that sounds like "one nature after the union."

O. Well, I need not mention flesh. I apply both these things to Christ.

E. I too admit this.

O. "But I say it as contemplating two natures in Him, and assigning to each what belongs to it <sup>i</sup>." But if Christ is "one nature,"

<sup>g</sup> Similarly, when Theophilus, sent by the Council of Constantinople to confer with Eutyches, had elicited from Him the admission that the Incarnate was perfect Man as well as perfect God, and had then said to him, "If these two perfects make up one Son, what hinders us from saying 'one Son from two natures ?'" Eutyches answered, "Far be it from me to say that Christ is from two natures,  $\eta$  φυσιολογεῖν τὸν Θεόν μου," above, p. 180. But Eutyches owned Christ to be perfect Man, both then and in his letter to S. Leo. (Leo, Ep. 21.)

<sup>h</sup> See above, p. 182.

<sup>i</sup> Compare Leo, Epist. 165. 6; "Although therefore in the one Lord Jesus Christ, true Son of God and man, there is one Person of the Word and the flesh, which has actions common without severance or division,

yet we have to take account of the qualities of the acts themselves, and discern by the gaze of pure faith to what the humility of the flesh is promoted, to what the loftiness of Deity bends down: what that is which is done by the flesh not without the Word, and what that is which is effected by the Word not without the flesh." (Compare the better known passage in Leo's Tome, c. 4, "Agit enim utraque forma.") He adds, c. 8, "As the Lord of majesty is said to have been crucified, so He who from eternity is equal to God is said to have been exalted: because the unity of Person remaining, one and the same, without separation, is both whole Son of Man because of the flesh, and whole Son of God because of His one Godhead with the Father." This letter was written August 17,

how can things so opposite as existence in the beginning and descent from creatures be appropriated to it? And consider this: is God the Word to be called the Maker of all things?

E. Yes, so Scripture teaches.

O. On which day did He make Adam?

E. The sixth.

O. How many generations are there from Adam to Abraham?

E. Twenty, I think.

O. From Abraham to Christ how many are reckoned by Matthew?

E. Forty-two.

O. How can Christ, if He is "one nature," have been the Creator, and also have been, after so many generations, formed in the Virgin's womb? how could He be both Adam's Creator and the son of Adam's descendants?

E. "I have said before that both the former and the latter pertain to Him as God Incarnate. For I know one nature of the Word, one that became incarnate."<sup>4</sup>

O. "Well, my good friend, I do not say that two natures of the Word became incarnate. I know that the nature of the Word is one; but I know also, that the flesh, by employing which He became incarnate, is of a different nature. And I think that you too acknowledge this. Did the Incarnation involve any change?"

E. I know not how He became incarnate, but I believe He did become so.

O. A Pharisee-like pretence of ignorance! Now I say distinctly, the Incarnation was devoid of all change. For, otherwise, after He became incarnate, Divine titles would not suit Him.

E. I have often confessed the Word to be unchangeable.

O. "It was, then, by taking flesh that He became incarnate."

E. Yes.

O. Then the nature of the Word which became incarnate, is one, and that of the flesh by assuming which the nature of the Word became incarnate, is another.

E. Clearly.

O. Was He then turned into flesh?

458, after Timothy "the Weasel" had written to the Emperor Leo, accusing S. Leo of Nestorianizing. On the meaning of "communicatio idiomatum" or "antidosis," which Damascene, iii. 5, calls a *περιχώρησις*, see above, p. 59.

<sup>4</sup> Cyril's phrase, believed by him to be Athanasian,—see above, p. 174. Here Theodoret implicitly accepts it, but in a sense of his own, as meaning,

the Word's own nature, His Godhead, is one: He has not two Godheads. But what Cyril meant by the phrase is repeatedly, in substance, admitted, or even urged, by Theodoret. In Epist. 126 he says that no Christian teacher "ever heard of any one who asserted one nature of flesh and Godhead;" and certainly Cyril did not assert this, but the contrary.

E. By no means.

O. Then, by your admission, the natures were not confounded, but continued entire. One Evangelist describes Divinity, another Humanity, as belonging to the one Christ. He Himself calls Himself now "Son of God," now "Son of Man." Now He honours S. Luke His Mother as His parent; now, as Lord, He rebukes her<sup>1</sup>. Nazareth and Capernaum are His country; yet He is "before Abraham was," This proves "two natures." 2. 4 : 8. 58.

E. To say two natures is to say "two Sons."

O. Then to say that Paul was composed of soul and body is to say "two Pauls<sup>m</sup>."

E. The case is not parallel.

O. I know that. In the latter case the union is natural of things contemporaneous and created<sup>n</sup>; in the former, it is a supernatural work of grace. "But though the union in the latter case is natural, the properties of the nature remain inviolate."

E. If the properties remained unmixed, how does the soul require nourishment with the body?

O. The soul does not require it. But the body which receives vital force from it, feels physical wants until death.

E. Surely hunger and thirst belong to the soul?

O. If they did, the soul would feel them after the death of the body.

E. What are the properties of the soul?

O. To be rational, simple, immortal, invisible.

E. And of the body?

O. To be composite, visible, mortal.

E. And from these two the man is constituted?

O. Yes.

E. Then we define man, a rational mortal animal?

O. Confessedly.

E. And we name him from this and from that set of qualities?

O. True.

E. As then we do not divide the man, but call him both rational and mortal, so we must ascribe to the undivided Christ what is Divine and what is human.

<sup>1</sup> Ως δευπότης ἐπιτιμᾶ. Perhaps Theodoret was thinking of Athan. Orat. c. Arian. iii. 41, as well as of Chrysostom on S. John ii. 4.

<sup>m</sup> This analogy (employed in the Quicunque) is used by Theodoret with the same illustration from Paul, in Epist. 143. "Every man has an immortal soul and a mortal body; and

no one to this day has called Paul two Pauls, because he has a soul and a body." Compare Epist. 130.

<sup>n</sup> So that Theodoret held "Creationism." See Liddon, Some Elements of Religion, p. 102. Theodoret does not mean to deny that the union in the Christ is in a true sense φυσική.

O. This is *my* argument: but you have not worked it out accurately. When we think of the human soul, do we not speak only of what belongs to its activity and nature?

E. Yes.

O. So also as to the body?

E. Yes.

O. But when we speak of the whole living being, we ascribe to it both sets of properties alike.

E. Excellently said.

O. So when we speak of Christ's "natures," we assign to each what belongs to it; but when we speak of the "Person," we must ascribe to Him alike what belongs respectively to the natures, so as to attach both sets of properties to Christ<sup>o</sup>, and call Him both God and Man, Son of God and Son of Man.

E. I agree with you that Christ's Person is one, and that to it belong what is Divine and what is human. But to say that in speaking of the natures we must assign properties to each, seems to me to dissolve the union<sup>p</sup>.

O. You did not think so in regard of properties of soul and body. Do you not admit the parallel between (1) soul and body, (2) Christ's Godhead and Manhood? Is there, then, a union without confusion in (1) and a confusion in (2)?

E. Assuredly, Christ's Deity, and also His flesh, are infinitely superior to soul and body: yet, I say, "After the union, one nature."

O. But to say this is grossly inconsistent with the admitted analogy.

<sup>o</sup> See also Epist. 104, that both classes of expressions belong to the one Son; the one to Him as God, the other to Him as Man. So says Cyril, Epist. p. 117, 134, 150. See above, p. 162. Compare the Formulary of 433 with Leo, Epist. 165, quoted above.

<sup>p</sup> Some such difficulty was found by bishops of Palestine and Ilyrienum, at the Chalcedonian Council, in certain passages of S. Leo's Tome, e. g. "Each form fulfills, in fellowship with the other, what belongs to it; that is, the Word works what belongs to the Word, and the flesh performs what belongs to the flesh," &c. By way of reply, the archdeacon of Constantinople read passages from Cyril's Epistles to a similar purport, Mansi, vi. 971 ff. compare Eulogius's defence of the Tome in Photius, no. 225, p. 242, and Ephraim's, ib. no. 229, p. 258. Of

these two patriarchs the latter says, "All the fathers ascribe τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, τῷ Θεῷ δὲ τὰ θεῖα," and the former combines Leo's "Agit utraque forma," &c. with the next passage, "Unus idemque est vere Dei Filius, et vere hominis Filius," and his "Tenet . . . proprietatem suam utraque natura" with a preceding statement, "Idem . . . Unigenitus . . . natus est de . . . Maria Virgine." This brings us to the question of the "Theandric ἐνέργεια," which is explained by Damascene, iii. 19, to mean, not the blending of two "energies" into one, but a joint action of the Divine and the human. Hence he will not allow the "Theandric energy" to be called "one." Compare S. Tho. Aquin. Sum. 3. 9. 19, and Card. Newman in Athan. Treatises, ii. 412, ed. 2, and Robertson, Hist. Ch. ii. 423.

E. I too avoid the word “confusion.” But to say two natures is to me like saying two Sons.

O. I avoid the two precipices<sup>q</sup>, both fusion and division. “I think it equally irreligious to doubt the one Son and to deny the duality of natures.” But, if an Arian was to tell you that the Son was inferior to the Father, quoting “Father, if it be possible, &c.” how would you meet him?

E. I should say that was spoken “economically.”

O. But he would answer by referring to the “economie” anthropomorphisms of the O. T. e.g.  
Gen. 3.  
8: 18. 21.

E. These “economies” are different. That of the O. T. relates to words, that of the N. T. to things.

O. He would rejoin: “What things?”

E. “Things relating to the Incarnation<sup>r</sup>. The Son of God, being made Man, exhibits both by words and things, now His flesh, now His Godhead :” e.g. in the text before us, the infirmity of fear.

O. Suppose he were to say, “He assumed a body only, His Godhead supplied the place of a soul?”

E. I should quote, “My soul is troubled,” &c. S. John  
12. 27.

O. Very apposite and ingenuous. But if he quoted “Your feasts My soul hateth ?” Isa. 1. 13.

E. I should rejoin, The O. T. speaks of God as having a mouth, eyes, ears, or hands also. And if in the Incarnate Christ soul does not mean soul, neither does body mean body; which is Docetism<sup>s</sup>.

O. An Apollinarian might ask, “What sort of soul?”

E. I should say,—I know only of one soul. But if you think there are two, the rational and the irrational, Christ had a soul which “increased in wisdom ;” therefore a rational soul. S. Luke  
2. 52.

O. Bravely done! you have “dissolved *that* union, and the much talked of ‘fusion<sup>t</sup>,’ not only in two ways but in three.” You have not only distinguished Godhead from Manhood, but have distinguished between two parts of Manhood. This makes not two, but three natures.

E. I had to meet those who deny the assumption of flesh, or soul, or mind, and also those who debase His Divinity.

O. Just so: you have been defending my position.

E. How so? I deny that there are “two Sons.”

O. Did you ever hear me affirm it?

E. You do so by affirming “two natures.”

O. Then, as *you* say three natures, you say three Sons.

<sup>q</sup> Compare Theod. Epist. 109.

<sup>r</sup>  $\tau\hat{\eta}s\ o\i k o n o m\hat{\eta}ls\ \mu\nu\sigma\tau\hat{\eta}r\iota o\nu$ , and we shall not differ from Marcion.”

Tome, 7.

<sup>s</sup> “ $\gamma\nu\rho\tau\theta\hat{\eta}\sigma\tau\eta\tau\iota\alpha\ \varphi\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\iota\alpha\ \tau\iota\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha$

<sup>t</sup> He means, such a conception of the “union” as involves a fusion.

E. I could not otherwise meet the opponents. But I deny "two natures" to exist "after the union."

O. How can you make but one? is it one made out of two? or one surviving another?

E. The Deity remained, the Manhood was absorbed by it.

O. A Heathenish and Manichean fancy, at once impious and absurd. How could the simple, incomposite, uncircumscribed nature absorb the nature it assumed?

E. As the sea might absorb a drop of honey<sup>u</sup>.

O. Sea and honey have much in common; but Godhead and manhood are infinitely different. But I will show you cases of things which are "mingled<sup>v</sup>," yet not "confounded."

E. "Who ever heard of a mixture that was no mixture?"

O. I will convince you. Light is diffused everywhere, except in some dark caverns: and is thus "mingled" with all the atmosphere, which, when thus illuminated, is itself called light. But the atmosphere remains what it was, moist or dry, &c. So iron, coming into contact with fire, ignites; the fire penetrates its whole essence; but this "complete union<sup>y</sup>" does not change the nature of the iron.

E. Yes, it does change it. "The iron is regarded as no longer iron, but fire: indeed it possesses the active force of fire<sup>z</sup>."

<sup>u</sup> Καταποθῆναι. The characteristic "Eutychian" assertion. Cp. Hooker, v. 53, 2. Demophilus, Arian bishop of Constantinople, had once said in a sermon that Christ's body was absorbed by His Divinity, as a pint of milk would be lost when poured into the ocean, *Philostorg.* ix. 14.

<sup>v</sup> An instance of the use of "mingling" for "uniting without confusion." See p. 138.

<sup>y</sup> Alluding to the description of the Personal Union as *ἕκπα*, admitted by the Easterns, see *Cyr. adv. Orient.* 4.

<sup>z</sup> Theodoret might almost seem to be referring to a celebrated passage of S. Cyril, translated at p. 626, and commented on at p. 175, of Dr. Pusey's "Doctrine of the Real Presence." Cyril wishes to show how the life-giving Word, by uniting "flesh" to Himself, could make that flesh life-giving. He takes two comparisons. "Dip a little bread into wine or oil, or other liquid, and you will find it has become full of that liquid's quality. When iron comes into contact with fire, then it is filled with the active force (*ἐνεργεία*) of fire, and being iron in its own nature, teems with the power of fire." Then he carries on

this thought to the Holy Eucharist. "God (the Word,) infuses a power of life into the elements, and changes them with a view to the energy of His own flesh . . . that the body of Life might be found in a life-giving seed." I.e. as oil to bread, or fire to iron, so is the Word, as Life-giver, to His flesh, and so (without pressing the parallelism to extremity) is His flesh to the elements. There is a certain interpenetration of B by A, which causes B to communicate A. As in the two illustrative cases, so in regard to the Incarnation and the Eucharist, a true relation established between A and B produces an "operation" of A through B, but without prejudice to the "nature" of B. So that Cyril would entirely agree with Theodoret as to the permanence of the "nature" of the flesh and of the Eucharistic elements. It may be added that in Schol. 10 Cyril illustrates the Incarnation from fire which penetrates wood, does not make it cease to be wood, but "transfers it into the power of fire, and carries on its own work in it, and is reckoned one with it;" so Theodoret says of red-hot gold, Epist. 145, that it has the colour and

O. But it is treated as iron still: its nature is not destroyed. If then “mixture” can take place in bodies without “fusion,” it is senseless to think of a “fusion” in respect to the unchangeable nature, and the annihilation of that nature which has been assumed for the benefit of mankind.”

E. I do not say that it was annihilated, but that it was changed into the essence of Godhead<sup>a</sup>.

O. Has not the Humanity<sup>b</sup>, then, its previous determinate being?<sup>c</sup>

E. By no means.

O. When did it undergo this change?

E. After the “complete union,” which took place in the conception.

O. Be it so. But long after the Nativity, we read of Him as an infant, as circumcised, growing up, hungering, walking, &c. All these are human incidents. Therefore, the Manhood did *not* lose its own nature after the union.

E. I was inaccurate: the change took place after the Resurrection.

O. But, did not the Risen Christ show His hands and feet? S. Luke 24. 40.

E. Yes—even as He entered when the doors were shut<sup>d</sup>. S. John 20. 19.

O. But He did that as He issued from the Virginal womb<sup>e</sup>, or as 20. 19. He walked on the sea.

O. He showed His hands only as He wrestled with Jacob.

E. On the contrary, He did it to remove all suspicion of His being incorporeal. “Handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have” . . . He did not say that He *was* flesh and bones<sup>f</sup>; He had them as distinct from Himself, although His Personal oneness was unimpaired; and He “ate before them,” neither in illusion, nor from physical need.

activity of fire, but “remains gold.” Cp. Hooker, v. 54, 6. On the theological use of *ἐνέργεια*, for the distinctive operation or faculty of operation, belonging to A or B, see Newman’s Athan. Treat. ii. 412, ed. 2.

<sup>a</sup> I. e. by a sort of “transubstantiation.”

<sup>b</sup> Τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος.

<sup>c</sup> Περιγραφήν. Where Eusebius, vi. 33, speaks of Beryllus as daring to say that our Saviour did not preexist in any proper and determinate form of being (*περιγραφήν*), he apparently means, “in no distinct personality.” But Theodoret seems to have held that *περιγραφή* or “circumscription” was characteristic of a created being as such (Angels inclusive), and that

God alone had an *ἀπερίγραφον φύσιν*, In Genes. Qu. 3; and see below, p. 215.

<sup>d</sup> Theodoret alludes to the “entering in when the doors were shut” in Epist. 145. S. Hilary, de Trin. iii. 20, insists that it was miraculous. Compare Prof. Macpherson on the Resurrection, p. 313; “Is there aught inconsistent with His claim to possess such a union of the Divine and human natures, when we find in the Gospels that He had a power over His human body which no ordinary man possesses?” &c.

<sup>e</sup> Dr. Pusey on Real Presence, p. 59.

<sup>f</sup> Theodoret is copying Athan. Ep. Epict. 7; c. Apollin. i. 6.

E. But if He did not need food, we must suppose that He only seemed to eat.

O. A body when made immortal could not need food. But He did eat, for Scripture says so: and He ate, to show that He was alive. What He then did by "economy" is not a law of nature. A risen body is, as such, "in corruptible:" so was His,—yet, by another "economy." He caused it to retain the wound-prints, which Thomas handled <sup>g.</sup>

E. But if it had become incorruptible and immortal, it was changed into another nature.

O. If so, men's bodies, at their resurrection, will be thus changed into another essence. But in fact, it is not their nature that will be changed, but their corruptibility and mortality. So a sickly body, when it becomes healthy, remains the same essence. So our bodies, when they shall rise again, will not have lost their own nature.

E. True.

O. Therefore the Lord's body, though risen and incorruptible, and glorified, and adored by the heavenly Powers, is still a body, having its previous circumscribed form <sup>h.</sup>

E. But after the Ascension, was it not changed into the Divine nature?

O. "Well, *I* could not say so in obedience to human reasonings. For I am not so rash as to say what Scripture has not said." And Scripture does tell me that He will return "as they had seen Him go into heaven." Now what they saw was a circumscribed nature. And an uncircumscribed nature is invisible: but He will be visible on the throne of judgment.

Acts 1.  
11.

Isa. 6. 1.

Zech. 12. 10.

Acts 7. 56.

Phil. 3. 21.

21.

21.

21.

21.

21.

21.

E. On that showing, even before His Incarnation He was "circumscribed." For Isaiah saw Him enthroned.

O. What He saw was not the Divine essence, but an appearance suitable to his capacity. At the Judgment, "all men will "look upon" the Judge's nature as visible," even as Stephen saw Him.

E. Well, but I think you cannot prove that the inspired writers speak of His ascended body as "a body."

O. Yes, the Apostle calls it "the body of His glory." It is not then changed into a different nature it remains a body, although filled with Divine glory. And the bodies of the saints will be "conformed" to His.

E. Will they then be equal to His?

O. They will partake of its glory, but in inferior measure; even as

<sup>g.</sup> Compare Athan. Ep. Epict. 6. Comp. Wilberforce on Incarnation,

<sup>h.</sup> Περγραφήν. This passage is c. 10, p. 188, referred to by Hooker, v. 51. 9.

He who is Light called the saints “light.” Have I not answered S. Matt. 5. 14.

E. One must “move every stone” to arrive at truth on questions of sacred doctrine.

O. Well, “the mystic symbols<sup>i</sup> which are offered to God by the priests<sup>k</sup>, of what are they symbols?”

E. Of the Lord’s Body and Blood.

O. Of what is really a body?

E. Yes.

O. Quite right: for a figure implies an existent original<sup>l</sup>. “If then the Divine mysteries are figures<sup>m</sup> of what is really a body, the Lord’s Body is even now a body; not changed into the nature of Godhead, but filled with Divine glory.”

E. I am glad you have referred to the Eucharist. “From it I will show you that the Lord’s Body is changed into a different nature. Let me ask, what do you call the gift which is offered ‘before the priest’s invocation’?”

O. It is not right to answer explicitly; perhaps some uninitiated persons may be present<sup>o</sup>.

E. Well, answer enigmatically.

O. Food, from certain seeds.

E. And the other symbol?

O. It has a general name, signifying a kind of drink.

E. “But after the consecration what do you call them?”

O. “Christ’s Body and Christ’s Blood.”

E. “And you believe that you receive Christ’s Body and Blood?”

O. “I do so believe.”

<sup>i</sup> See Dr. Pusey’s *Doctrine of Real Presence*, p. 94 ff. on the use of this class of terms for the consecrated elements.

<sup>k</sup> Evidently he supposes the Elements not to lose their character as oblations after the invocation or completion of the consecration. Compare Hammond’s *Liturgies*, Eastern and Western, pp. 18, 43, 75, 113, 159, and Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. 23. 6.

<sup>l</sup> Ἀρχέτυπον,—what he calls further on ἀλήθεια. Comp. Pusey, on *Real Presence*, p. 112.

<sup>m</sup> Ἀντίτυπα, used for what we should call types, or figures, as in the *Liturgy of S. Basil*, Hammond’s *Liturgies*, p. 114: and in *Apost. Const.* v. 14: vi. 30. So S. Irenaeus in *Fragni*, 38. (Stieren, i. 855,) calls the bread and the cup ἀντίτυπων, and says

in i. 5, 6. that according to Valentine the Church of spiritual men was an ἀντίτυπον of the Αἰον Ecclesia. So Cyril of Jerusalem calls the elements ἀντίτυπον of the Body and Blood, Catech. 23. 20. But Nestorius reverses this use, “This bread, of which the Body is ἀντίτυπον,” ap. Cyr. adv. Nest. iv. 5, (Pusey, p. 200;) and in doing so has the authority of 1 S. Pet. 3. 11, where ἀντίτυπον means what we can an antitype.

<sup>n</sup> For the Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the West-Syrian Liturgies, see, e.g. S. James’s, Hammond, p. 43.

<sup>o</sup> Observe the *Disciplina Arcani*. See above, p. 184. It is remarkable that Theodoret refrains from mentioning “bread and wine,” but does not hesitate to speak of the “Body and Blood.”

E. As then the symbols of the Lord's body and blood are different things after the invocation from what they were before, "so His body, after it was taken up (into heaven), was changed into the Divine essence."

O. "You are caught in the nets which you wove<sup>p</sup>. For the mystical symbols do *not* depart from their own nature after the consecration: they remain in their former essence, and figure, and form, and are seen and touched as they were before; but are thought of as what they have become, and are believed and worshipped, as being those things which are believed<sup>q</sup>. Compare then the image with the archetype; for the type must be like the reality. That body has its previous form and circumscriptio, and, in short, bodily essence: but it became immortal after the resurrection, and superior to corruption, and was raised to a seat on God's right hand, and is adored by all creation, and called the body of the Sovereign of Nature<sup>r</sup>."

E. But the symbol is no longer called what it was before, but "body." Therefore the reality ought to be no longer called body, but "God."

O. No: the symbol is also called "bread of life<sup>s</sup>," the Lord's own phrase; and the Body itself is called Divine, the body of our Lord, who is God and Man<sup>t</sup>.

<sup>p</sup> This is the famous Eucharistic passage, (translated in Pusey on Real Presence, p. 85.) It shows that Theodoret could assert, as unquestionable Church doctrine, that the consecrated elements retained their "nature" and "essence" as bread and wine, even as S. Chrysostom had said before him (Ep. to Cesarius,) and Pope Gelasius said after him (De duabus Naturis.) But it also shows that the participation of Christ's Body and Blood, through those "symbols," was believed by him to be real. Its testimony is not negative only, but positive. "Theodoret reasons thus: There is an allowed analogy between the Incarnation and the Eucharist. In each, there is a higher part united to a lower. 'The bread is to the Body as the Manhood to the Godhead. . . . The two unions so correspond as that the reality and distinction of the parts in the one union imply the like reality and distinction in the other. The argument vanishes, if there is not in both cases alike a real outward and a real inward part, and a real union of the two.' MS. by Mr. Keble, Theodoret could not have argued, in effect; "The bread, which is admitted

to be only thus far related to Christ's body that to receive it in faith is to receive the benefits of Christ's death, retains its nature after it has been placed in this relation. Therefore Christ's Manhood, which is admitted to be taken into a relation of personal union with God the Word, retains its nature likewise." The cases would have been so different, that comparison, and argument from comparison, would have been out of question. Of course the analogy between the hypostatic and sacramental unions cannot be pressed beyond this point, that they are both mysteriously real.

<sup>q</sup> Reverence is paid to the visible elements because they are regarded as having in some true sense "become that" which is an object of faith and is "received" through them.

<sup>r</sup> The argument is, As the consecrated bread receives honour by virtue of its sacramental union with Christ's body, its "archetype," yet remains bread, so that "archetype" is honoured by virtue of its personal union with the Word, yet remains a body.

<sup>s</sup> So in the Roman Oblation, "the holy bread of eternal life."

<sup>t</sup> Cyril would have heartily echoed

E. Can you cite any Saints who have distinguished the natures after the union?

O. (replies by citing twenty Fathers, Ignatius, Smyrn. 3; Irenæus, Hippolytus, Eustathius, Athanasius, *Orat. e. Ari.* ii. 70, *Ep. Epict.* 9; [another passage not found in it:] *Serm. Major*, 29, *de Incarn.* et *e. Arian.* 2, 3, 22; Ambrose, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Amphilochius, Theophilus, Chrysostom, Flavian of Antioch, Cyril of Jerusalem, Antiochus, Hilary, Augustine, Severian, Atticus, Cyril of Alexandria, [Ep. *ad Nest.* 2, Pusey, p. 6, a sentence which suggested part of the *Definitio of Chalcedon*] *Ep. ad Joan.* [part of the *Formulary of Reunion* and another sentence] *Comm. on Hebrews, Scholia 4, 13, 27.*)

E. I did not think that they distinguished the natures after the union, but I find that they carry the distinction to excess.

O. It is rash to blame those noble champions of faith. (He quotes several passages from Apollinaris himself, as affirming a union which is not a fusion, and a distinction between Godhead and Manhood after the union. “Truth,” O. adds, “compelled the first inventor of the fusion to own this.”)

E. Even musical chords require some rest, and so we rational beings may reasonably measure our exertions by our capacities. Let us put off the discussion of Impassibility until to-morrow.

O. David exhorts us to meditate on the Divine oracles day and Ps. 1. 2. night: but let us do as you desire.

### *DIALOGUE III. “IMPASSIBILIS.”*

O. (1) I have proved “that God the Word is immutable, and that He became man, not by being converted into flesh, but by assuming in perfection the nature of man; and (2) that after this union He remained what He was, unmingled, impassible, unchanged, uncircumscribed, and also preserved in its entirety the nature which He had assumed:” this the Scriptures and the Church teachers have affirmed. It remains to speak of His Passion: a subject most profitable, for from this source flows our salvation.

E. I agree with you. But let us alter the order of our debate: let me ask questions, do you answer.

O. Be it so.

this, which is put in to show that majesty of Christ’s Body. Cp. Epist. “Orthodox” recognises the unique 145.

E. Who was it that suffered ?

O. Our Lord Jesus Christ.

E. Was it then a man that saved us ?

O. Why, did we admit that our Lord was Man only ?

E. What do you believe Christ to be ?

O. The Son of the living God, made Man.

E. Is God's Son God ?

O. Yes, God, having the same essence with the God who begat Him <sup>u</sup>.

E. "It was God, then, who endured the Passion."

O. "If He was crucified incorporeally, then ascribe the Passion to the Godhead <sup>x</sup>." But if it was by taking flesh that He became Man, why not say that what was possible suffered ?

<sup>u</sup> Contrast Theodore, explaining the Sonship as adoptive, Mansi, ix. 211, and as constituted by preeminent virtue, ib. 217. He also said that the Man was Son by grace, the Word being Son by nature: that Jesus was "Son of God" in a higher degree than others, but was equally with them a Son by grace, ib. 219.

<sup>x</sup> See Tillemont, xv. 253, that while "he refuses to admit the expression, 'The Word suffered in flesh,' on the ground that it is obscure, open to a very bad interpretation, and not authorised by Scripture, he at the same time acknowledges its Catholic sense in a very clear manner, and only rejects what all the orthodox rejected. Yet it is strange that he did not approve of an expression which it is easy to find in Scripture, which was commonly used in the Church, and which was based on the maxim which he himself establishes in his Dialogues, —that the union of the two natures makes the names common." In fact, this contention of Theodoret's is inconsistent with his previous admission as to the One Personality. If the phrase "God suffered in flesh," is altogether inadmissible, so is the Pauline statement that "the Lord of glory was crucified;" so is the statement that God was born in flesh, or that Mary was Theotocos. If these statements are orthodox, the phrase censured has a good meaning. But this may be urged in Theodoret's behalf, that the Apollinarian controversy had made men specially sensitive as to any association of one particular human condition, that of possibility, with

the name of "God the Word." Under the influence of this sensitiveness he did not see that, since the Incarnation, all sinless human conditions were equally predictable of "God the Word" with due explanation, equally non-predictable without it. In this context, however, Theodoret is evidently bent on confuting those who would infer the possibility of the Godhead in the Incarnate from the phrase which he attacks. All that he contends for is contained in Cyril's own words in the great epistle which had been received with such applause at the Council of Ephesus, Ep. ad Nest. 2. (Pusey, pp. 6, 8) "The Divinity is impassible and incorporeal; but since that body which had become proper to Him (God the Word) suffered, *He* Himself is said to have suffered this for us, for the Impassible One was in the suffering body. And in the same way do we think of His dying, for God the Word is by nature . . . immortal . . . but since His own body . . . tasted death for all men, *He* is said to have suffered this death, &c." In the Epistle to John, Cyril says, "We all acknowledge the Word of God to be impassible, although He Himself, arranging (*oikouμαντ*) the mystery with all wisdom, is seen to ascribe to Himself the sufferings which befell His own flesh; therefore Petersays, "Christ having suffered in flesh," and not in the nature of the ineffable Godhead; for, in order that He might be believed to be the Saviour of the whole (*τῶν ὅλων*) He refers to Himself, as I said, by an economic appropriation, the sufferings of His own flesh." Cp. Cyril, Com-

E. But He took flesh, just to enable the impassible to suffer through the possible.

O. If He suffered apart from flesh, why did He take flesh? It would be a superfluity.

E. The Divine nature is immortal, but was united to the mortal in order to taste of death through it.

O. But by no such conjunction could what is naturally immortal undergo death.

monitory to Posidonius, and Schol. 4, 13, 36, &c. See too Theodoret, in the last section of the "Demonstratio per Syllogismos," "The Divine nature . . . not feeling pain from the Passion, but having appropriated the Passion as belonging to its own temple and the flesh united to it, on which account also believers are called members of Christ." It is probable enough that Theodoret was thinking in part of S. Athanasius, *c. Apollin.* ii. 11; but see note there. Epiphanius, while insisting "that the Godhead was in itself impassible," and that "God remained impassible," says that "He suffered with His flesh," *Haer.* 69. 24. Indeed Theodoret himself says, "It is plain that some things belong to Him as God, others as Man: so too both possibility and impassibility attach to the Lord Christ, for He suffered as to His manhood, but He remained impassible as God," *Epist.* 130. Comp. Athan. *c. Apollin.* i. 11. "It is He Himself who suffered, and who did not suffer." This is quite in accordance with Cyril's teaching. On the substantial agreement between Cyril and Theodoret on this point (an agreement not incompatible with their habitually approaching the subject from different points of view) see Hooker, v. 53. 4, to the effect that Theodoret meant that Christ's Divine nature could not suffer, but Cyril referred to "the Person of Christ, who being verily God, suffered death, but in the flesh, and not in that substance for which the name of God is given Him." Theodoret in this Dialogue avoids the Nestorianizing language of his criticisms on Cyril's 12th article; and it is plain from *Epist.* 130 that what he meant to guard was "the assumption, by the Word, of human nature in completeness," and the "unconfused" character of "the union." "If," he says, "these points

are admitted, all the rest will go straight." If Cyril did not verbally admit the first proposition, he admitted it in effect: the second he admitted in so many words; and while we observe that Cyril, in 436, treated the proposition, "The Word, remaining impassible, suffered in His own flesh for us," as one of three main points to be set forth against Nestorianism (Synod. 208) we must also appreciate the motive for such urgency, as expressed in his letter to Valerian. Doubtless, he there says (*Epist.* p. 163), the Deity is impassible. "But who was it who said to His Father, 'A body hast Thou prepared Me?' How could one man die as equivalent for all ( $\pi\acute{a}rr\acute{a}v \acute{a}v\tau\acute{a}\xi\acute{o}s$ ) if the Passion is considered to be simply that of a man? But if He suffered humanly, in appropriating the sufferings of His own flesh, then indeed, then we may say, and with good reason, that the death of One in flesh is considered an equivalent for the life of all: not as the death of one like to ourselves, although He became one of us, but that, being God by nature, He was incarnate and made man." (He had used  $\tau\acute{a}v \acute{a}l\acute{a}v \acute{a}v\tau\acute{a}\xi\acute{o}s$  in *Ad Pulcherr.* &c. (Pusey, p. 269.) At the very opening of the controversy Proclus had said that "God must die for sinners," but explained himself further on by saying, "What He was, saved; what He became, suffered" (*Homily*, 5, 9.); and had spoken of Him, God and Man, as more than equivalent in satisfaction for the multitude of offenders (*ib.* 6.) It is observable that Cyril's 12th article was a reproduction of one of the anathematisms in Damasus' letter to Paulinus, Theod. v. 11; after condemning any who attributed the Passion to the Divine nature, Damasus adds, "If any one does not confess that the Word of God suffered in flesh . . . and tasted

E. Prove that, and resolve my doubts.

O. You grant that soul is immortal, body mortal, and that from these natures the man subsists.

E. Yes.

O. "Then, the immortal is joined to the mortal. But, when the conjunction or union<sup>y</sup> is dissolved, the mortal submits to the law of death, but the soul remains immortal, although death was brought in by sin." Is not death a penalty?

Gen. 2. 17. E. Yes, Scripture teaches so.

O. "Then, since both soul and body sinned, why does body alone bear this penalty?"

E. Because the tasting of the forbidden fruit was a bodily act, and diffused that fruit throughout the bodily frame. Justly then did the body alone suffer the penalty.

O. Physiology does not cover the whole ground: those bodily acts depended on the act of the soul. Therefore the body could not sin alone.

E. But it makes the soul possess sin.

O. How?

E. Through its members.

O. But those members can equally work for good.

E. Yes.

O. Body and soul, then, can obey or can break the law.

E. Yes.

O. But in both cases, soul acts first: the mind conceives the good or bad idea, then the body serves as an organ for expressing it. Why then does the body suffer alone?

E. Because the immortal cannot die.

O. Yet what shared in sin should share in penalty. The soul, however, did not share the penalty: although in the life to come it will go into Hell with the body.

S. Matt. 10. 28. E. Yes.

O. We see then that death is impossible for an immortal nature. How, then, could the Uncreated One die?

E. He died "in flesh."

O. But what is immortal<sup>z</sup> cannot die at all. Again let us look at the question in another aspect.

E. Yes, let us try every means of reaching the truth.

death in flesh, . . . let him be anathema."

<sup>y</sup> Here he uses the Nestorian term, *συναρθέιας*, but explains it by the Cyrillic *ἐνώσεως*.

<sup>z</sup> The immortal nature,—the God.

head,—as Cyril repeatedly affirmed, could not die. But the Divine Person could die, as He could be born, "in flesh," "as touching His manhood."

O. Are not those who teach vice or virtue worthy of greater punishment or reward than those who learn of them? And is not the Devil a teacher of evil?

E. Yes, a teacher of teachers,—father and teacher of all wickedness.

O. And Adam and Eve were his first scholars; and sentence of death came on Adam and his posterity. How is it, then, that the scholars are punished more severely than the teacher, and by the righteous Judge?

E. The teacher is doomed to the unquenchable fire of Hell: being of immortal nature, he could not be punished by death.

O. Nor could the worst of sinners, were they immortal. Why then do you not shrink from saying that “the Fountain of immortality and righteousness suffered death?”

E. Your argument would hold, were it not that He suffered voluntarily.

O. But God does not will to do what is abhorrent to His nature. “All things are possible to God” must be taken with this limitation<sup>a</sup>. To sin, for instance, is impossible to Him. He is very and intellectual Light; He could not will to become,—could not become,—darkness; His nature could not become visible, nor comprehensible, for it is incomprehensible<sup>b</sup>, and invisible. Nor could He become non-existent: nor could the Father become Son nor the Son Father, nor either of Them the Holy Spirit. Other things could be mentioned, which are impossible to the Almighty; the impossibility being indeed a proof of boundless power, not of weakness.

E. How so?

O. Because each of these impossibilities exhibits the Divine immutability,—the utmost extent of goodness,—of truth,—of justice,—e. g. “it is impossible for God to lie,” “He cannot deny Himself.”

Heb. 6.

This shows His supernatural power, for it shows that He is God.

18.

2 Tim. 2.

13.

E. This is true, and accordant with Scripture.

O. Then His immortality is as inseparable from Him as are His other perfections.

<sup>a</sup> See Epist. 144, that those who found fault with the expression, “some things are altogether impossible to God,” must be either imperfectly informed in points of doctrine, or of no fixed opinions. “Ask them whether it is possible for God . . . to lie . . . or again, to be unjust . . . unwise, &c. Then say to them, There are many things impossible to God, but these impossibilities do not indicate incapacity, but are tokens of the greatest

power. For when we say of our own soul that it is impossible for it to die, we do not impute to it weakness, but assert that it has the power of being immortal.” Compare Origen c. Cels. iii. 70, that “God can do everything that it is possible for Him to do without ceasing to be God and good and wise,” and “the power to do evil is contrary to His omnipotence.”

<sup>b</sup> Ἀκατάληπτος—καὶ πάμπαν ἀνέφικτος.

Rom. 5.     E. But Scripture asserts the death of God's own Son.

10.        O. Yes, but we have already admitted that the Son appeared in perfect human nature.

          E. We have.

          O. On this account then, He was called Son of Man.

          E. True.

          O. "Therefore our Lord Jesus Christ is also truly our God. For, of these natures, the one He had always, the other He truly assumed."

          E. Undeniably.

          O. Therefore, as Man, He suffered: as God He could not suffer<sup>c</sup>.

          E. "Why then does Scripture say that the Son of God suffered?"

          O. "Because the body that suffered was His body. Look at it Gen. 27, thus: 'Isaiae could not see:' does that refer to his soul?"

1.        E. No, only to his body.

Amos 7.     O. And when Amos or Samuel is called "the seer," does that 12. refer to his body?

1 Sam. 9.     E. No, only to his soul.

18.        Heb. 12.     O. "The hands that hang down, the feeble knees"—does this refer to bodily limbs, or is it an expression for spiritual languor?

          E. The latter, of course.

          O. Yet these distinctions are not expressed in Scripture: they are assumed. We are supposed to distinguish between what is bodily and what is spiritual.

          E. Naturally: for we are endowed with reason.

          O. Then let us think reasonably as to our Creator and Saviour, and distinguish between what belongs to His Godhead and what to His Manhood.

          E. But if we do, we dissolve that perfect<sup>d</sup> union.

          O. No more than you dissolve the union of soul and body by distinguishing their properties.

          E. Scripture says, the Son of God suffered.

          O. Nor do I say that any other suffered: but, the Godhead being impassible, we attribute suffering to the body.

          E. Then it was a body that wrought our salvation.

      c Cyril explicitly disowns what his opponents imputed to him under the name of "Theopathia," while at the same time he maintains that the Son of God suffered in His earthly nature, or humanly, because the "flesh that suffered was His," Epist. p. 144. And in the text Theodore really grants all that Cyril demanded: for he admits that it was "He" who suffered as Man, that selfsame "He" who is "God the Word." In Epist. 144 he says, "Since the body assumed was called the body of the Only-begotten Son of God, He refers to Himself the suffering of that body," and quotes Leo, "the Son of God suffered as He could suffer, according to the nature which He assumed." Compare p. 131.

      d *Ἄκρας*, see p. 201.

O. Not the body of a mere man, but of the only Son of God<sup>c</sup>. If the figure of that body<sup>f</sup> is worshipped and venerated, how can the archetype itself be insignificant?

E. "I do not so regard it: but I will not dissever it from the Godhead."

O. "Nor do we divide the union: we do but take account of the properties of the natures." You will soon join with us in doing so.

E. Are you prophesying?

O. No: but I know the power of truth. But when you read, S. John "I and My Father are one," and, "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father," do you refer this to the flesh or the Godhead?

E. To the Godhead, of course.

O. And also, "the Word was God?"

E. Yes.

O. But when "Jesus sat wearied by the well<sup>g</sup>," did this weariness <sup>lb. 4</sup> <sup>6.</sup> belong to the Godhead or to the body?

E. "I cannot bear to divide things that are united."

O. "Then you ascribe the weariness to the Godhead?"

E. "To me it seems so."

O. This is against Scripture, which says that God cannot be Isa. 40. wearied, and that He preserves His servants from weariness.

<sup>28, 31.</sup>

E. Of course, as God, He could not suffer: but after His Incarnation, He endured the Passion.

O. But how? by receiving it in His Godhead, or by allowing the possible nature to feel it, in proof of His being Man in reality, not in semblance<sup>h</sup>? Do we say, the Divine nature was uncircumscribed?

E. Yes.

O. But the uncircumscribed nature, being omnipresent, cannot need to pass hither and thither, nor to walk,—therefore it cannot be wearied.

E. But "Jesus was wearied:" and Jesus is God.

<sup>c</sup> This was what Cyril so earnestly pressed: see above, p. 169.

<sup>f</sup> Τύπος. Alluding to the reverence shown to the consecrated elements, see p. 208. For this use of *τύπος* see Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. 22. 3. It is equivalent to *σύμβολον*, as used in Dial. ii. On the passage in the text, see Dr. Pusey's Doctrine of Real Presence, p. 112.

<sup>g</sup> See Pearson on Creed, vol. i. p. 324, ed. Burton. S. Augustine says, "He thirsted who . . . spiritually is . . . the fountain of the thirsty: He was wearied by an earthly journey, who has made Himself our way to

heaven," de Catech. Rud. 40. So much as to the hypostatic "appropriation," by Him who is "very God," of the human acts or properties, "saying," as S. Leo says, Ep. 28. 3, "the property of each nature and substance." He illustrates this salvo further on: "To thirst, to be wearied, is clearly human. But . . . to bestow living water . . . is unquestionably Divine . . . For although in our Lord Jesus Christ there is one Person of God and Man, aliud tamen est unde in utroque communis est contumelia, aliud unde communis est gloria," ib. 4.

<sup>h</sup> Φαντασία. See p. 87.

O. Consider, then, how the being wearied and not wearied can belong to one Person<sup>4</sup>. Even a “barbarian” would understand that, granting the union of the dissimilar natures, the properties of both are assumed by Christ’s Person, but are ascribed to the natures respectively: e.g. unweariedness to the uncircumscribed nature, weariness to that which passes from place to place<sup>5</sup>. As you yourself have admitted these to be bodily affections, you distinguish the properties of Godhead and Manhood. My prediction, therefore, comes true.

E. But I have not divided the one Son into two.

O. Nor do I, my friend: I only recognise what belongs to the several natures.

Rom. 5. 10. E. “Scripture does not teach us such distinctions.” It spake of “the Son” as having died,—of “the Lord” as raised again.

1 Cor. 6. 14. O. It says too, that Stephen and the patriarchs were buried. Were their souls buried?

E. No.

O. So in other Scripture narratives of burial and death, Scripture “uses names which signify both soul and body;” but we distinguish between the immortal souls and the buried or slain bodies. If you do the like as to names of men, why not as to the Son of God?

E. Scripture teaches that the Son of God suffered.

O. But Paul interprets the Passion, and shows what nature it was that suffered.

E. Prove this, as soon as you can.

Heb. 2. 11. O. “He is not ashamed to call them brethren.”

E. What of that?

O. “Brethren” points to kinship: kinship belongs to Manhood. Read on in that context.

1b. 2. 14. 15. E. (reads) “Forasmuch as the children partook of flesh,” &c.

O. This passage, I think, explains itself.

E. I do not see in it the proof you promised.

<sup>4</sup> Προσώπω. The word *πρόσωπον* is used by Theodoret as equivalent to *ὑπόστασις*; it has lost that older sense of “aspect” or “character” which led S. Basil to suspect it, unless guarded by *ὑπόστασις*, Epist. 210, 5.

<sup>5</sup> Compare this with the Formulary of Reunion; and with Theod. Epist. 101; “Applying (to Him) as man what is said respecting humiliation and in accordance with the nature assumed; and again (to Him) as God what befits God . . . . not dividing Him into two persons (*πρόσωπα*) but teaching that both classes of expres-

sions belong to the Only-begotten, the one, to Him as God and Maker, and the other to Him as having become Man for our sakes.” And Epist. 130, “It is plain to those who think aright that some things befit **Him** as God, others as Man. Thus both possibility and impassibility belong to the Lord Christ. For He suffered as to His Manhood, but remained impassible as God,” &c. He had said just before, “Although we recognize the diversity of the natures, τὸν ἔνα χρῆ προσκυνεῖν τὸν.” See above, p. 172, and compare pp. 178, 182.

O. It shows that, to destroy the power of death by a just method, He took on Him the firstfruits of what was liable to death, kept it spotless, and then allowed death to seize and devour it: but because of death's injustice towards the firstfruits, He put a stop to its unjust tyranny over all the others. For since He has restored to life the firstfruits, then unjustly devoured, He will cause the rest of mankind to rise too<sup>1</sup>. The Deity therefore is impassible.

E. The passage does not, to my mind, prove this.

O. Surely the text shows that He took flesh and blood, in order to have a nature that could suffer, and thus destroy the power of Satan?

E. "How did He destroy that power through the flesh?"

O. "By what weapons did Satan enslave the nature of men?"

E. By sin.

O. What penalty did God assign to disobedience?

E. Death.

O. Sin, then, is death's mother, Satan is sin's father<sup>m</sup>.

E. Yes.

O. Sin, then, it was which attacked men's nature, and brought it into relations with her father and her offspring.

E. Clearly.

O. Therefore the Maker, willing to crush the power of both<sup>n</sup>, assumed the nature thus attacked, kept it free from sin, and rescued it from Satan's power. For, death being the penalty of sinners, after death had unjustly seized on a sinless body, He first of all raised again that body, and then promised release to those that had justly been death's bondmen.

E. "But do you think it just, that the bodies justly given over to death should share in resurrection with that which had been unjustly detained?"

O. And do *you* think it just, that when Adam broke the commandment, the race should follow the ancestor?

E. Even if they had not shared in that disobedience, yet they had committed other sins, deserving of death.

O. But among the race were not sinners only, but just men, as prophets and apostles: yet they all died<sup>o</sup>.

E. How could they help dying, being of mortal parentage? When Adam became a father, he had already sinned, and become subject to death.

<sup>1</sup> See his 10th oration "de Providentia," (Op. iv, 671) for a rhetorical expansion of this idea in application to Satan. (Cp. Oxenham, Cath. Doc. trine of the Atonement, p. 128.)

<sup>m</sup> See the same imagery in Paradise Lost, ii. 727 ff.

<sup>n</sup> I. e. Sin and Satan.

<sup>o</sup> The idea of original sin does not appear in this passage.

O. Yes, "you have well shown why it is that we share in death." Let us apply it to the Resurrection, "for the remedy must be consonant to the disease." As "in the condemnation of the head of the race, the race was also condemned: so when our Saviour took away the curse, our nature acquired its freedom." As we died in Adam, so we rise in Christ.

E. "Church doctrines must be stated with proofs, not by mere affirmation<sup>p.</sup>" Does Scripture teach this?

O. (reads Rom. 5, 15 ff. 1 Cor. 15, 20 ff.) Observe here the comparison of Adam with Christ<sup>q</sup>,—the disease "with the cure, the sin with the abundance of righteousness, the curse with the blessing, . . . death with life, the man with the Man." Although Christ is not Man only, but God before the ages<sup>r</sup>, yet Paul names Him from the nature He assumed. To it belong the justification, the combat, the victory, the Passion, the Death, the Resurrection: in it we 'partake,' with it those will reign who practise truth and the mode of life belonging to the Kingdom. With it, I mean, not as if I were separating from it the Deity, but as referring to its properties."

Rom. 8.  
32. E. But, "He spared not His own Son." What Son?  
O. There is One Son of God, the Only-begotten, "His own Son."  
E. *He*, then, was "given up."  
O. He was: but not without a body, as we have often admitted.  
E. We have often admitted that He took body and soul: but it was "the Son" that was not spared.

Gen. 22.  
16. O. Isaiae was "not spared;" but was he slain?  
E. No, God forbade it, though Abraham was willing.  
O. Then you do not take that passage according to the bare letter. So here, you should understand that it was not the Godhead, but the flesh that was not spared. Was Abraham's sacrifice "a type of that which was offered for the world?"

E. No, I cannot take what is read as "panegyric<sup>s</sup>" in churches to be a rule of doctrines.

O. "You ought to have followed Church doctors." But, however, remember, Abraham saw Christ's day.

E. "I believe that type."  
O. "Compare it, then, with the reality. In both there is a father, and a beloved son carrying the material of the sacrifice. . . It is said

<sup>p</sup> Ἀποδεικτικῶς, οὐκ ἀποφαντικῶς.  
That is, Scripture is the verifying authority for oral Church teaching.

<sup>q</sup> On the Two Adams see Cyril ady. Nest. iii. 6 (Pusey, p. 173.) and Augustine de Pecc. Originali, c. 24.

<sup>r</sup> Θεός προαύλιος. So in Epist.

145.

<sup>s</sup> I.e. by way of setting forth the obedience or faith of an individual. See Theodoret, Epist. 151, on "panegyrical" language extolling the dignity of the Virgin. Theodoret somewhat evades Gen. 22, 16.

that the two events took place on the same hill-top<sup>t</sup>: and the number of the days and nights agree, and the subsequent resurrection. For Isaac was offered up, in his father's purpose, as soon as the order came; and was saved from death three days after. And the ram presented the figure of a cross.<sup>u</sup> An image cannot have all the points of the archetype. Isaac and the ram, as symbolizing the difference of natures, suit the conditions of a type: not so as to suggest a hypostatic separation, for none such exists in the anti-type: the union of Godhead and Manhood which we assert involves one undivided personality<sup>v</sup>; we think of the Self-same as both God and Man, and all the properties of Godhead and of Manhood we predicate of His One Person. As then the ram cannot represent the resurrection, there is a partition of the type: the ram represents the death, Isaac himself the resurrection. Consider also other types, embodied in the Mosaic sacrifices: e. g. the Paschal lamb, the red heifer burned outside the camp, and the two goats, on the day of atonement, one slain, one let go,—typical of the Manhood and of the Godhead.

Cp. Heb. 13. 12.

Lev. 16.

E. Is it not blasphemous to compare the Lord to goats?

8, 9.

O. No, unless it be so to compare Him to a serpent, a worse creature than a goat.

E. But our Lord is called a lamb, a sheep.

O. As to that, Paul calls Him “sin” and a “curse;” in which aspect, He is the antitype of the serpent and the goat. And He died for sheep and goats, the just and the unjust.

2 Cor. 5. 21.

Gal. 3. 13.

E. But if two goats are a type, they suggest two Persons.

O. One goat could not be a type at once of Godhead and of Manhood. See also the sacrifice in which one bird was slain, the other dipt in the blood of the slain bird and set free.

Lev. 14. 51.

E. I cannot enter into obscure arguments.

O. Will you then blame Paul for his reference to Sarah and Hagar?

Gal. 4. 24.

E. Ten thousand more arguments will not “persuade me to divide the Passion!” The Angel said, “See the place where the Lord lay.”

S. Matt. 28. 6.

O. So, on entering a church, we ask, “Who is it that lies in the shrine?” The answer is perhaps, Thomas<sup>x</sup>, or John Baptist<sup>y</sup>, or Stephen<sup>z</sup>, or some other Saint: even though there are but a very few relics of the saint there preserved. No one supposes that the soul is there! By “the Lord,” the Angel meant His body,—not<sup>t</sup> Cf. “Speaker's Commentary.”<sup>u</sup> “Ἐν πρόσωπον ἀδιάπετον. This entirely satisfies the requirements of Cyril's doctrine,<sup>x</sup> E. g. at Edessa, Soc. iv. 18.<sup>y</sup> See Soz. vii. 21.<sup>z</sup> See Soz. ix. 16. Compare for this

illustration Theod. Ep. 130, where he gives as instances the names of the martyr Julian, or Romanus, or Timothy; and Ep. 144, as to the churches of Dionysius and Cosmas.

S. Matt. 27, 59,  
&c.  
1 Cor. 15, 3, 4.

His soul, nor His uncircumscribed Godhead. The Evangelists speak of Jesus' body as buried. We ourselves often say, "So and so is buried here." Scripture speaks of Aaron and Samuel as buried.

Paul speaks in the same sense when he says, "Christ died and was buried."

E. "You have hit yourself with your own darts :" he says "Christ."

O. You have forgotten my long argument about bodies being called by the name of persons<sup>a</sup>. Why did Paul write thus to the Corinthians?

E. Because some had told them that there could be no resurrection of bodies.

O. Why then, to prove that there would be, did he adduce the Lord's Resurrection?

E. Because it was sufficient to prove that we should all rise again.

O. What then made His death like to ours, so that His Resurrection should be an evidence of ours?

E. The Son of God died to destroy death<sup>b</sup>, and rose again to proclaim that men should rise.

O. But between God and men, how vast the difference!

E. But God the Word was like men in having a body.

O. It was His body, then, to which belonged death and Resurrection. And this is the point of Paul's argument. "From what took place, he establishes what is future: by what is disbelieved, he excludes what is believed. If, he says, A seems impossible, then B is false. But if B is credible, then A is credible." He represents Christ as "the firstfruits" of the resurrection, as the Second Adam, and therefore He says, "By man came also the resurrection."

E. Is Christ, then, merely a man?

O. Away with the thought! but it was as Man, not as God, that He died and rose, and we shall rise "with Him."

E. No doubt, it was the body that died and rose again. The Apostle implies an "affinity o' essence" between the Risen One and ourselves. Yet I cannot bear to hear the Passion ascribed to the human nature alone. I must think it right to say that God the Word suffered in flesh.

O. "I have often proved that what was immortal by nature could by no means die. If then He died, He was not immortal. How perilous are blasphemous words!"

E. "By nature He was immortal: but, having become man, He suffered."

O. Then He underwent a change. But the essence of the Trinity is admitted to be immutable.

<sup>a</sup> P. 190.

<sup>b</sup> See Athan. c. Apollin. ii. 17.

E. Peter says, "Christ suffered in flesh." Why do you not say that 1 S. Pet. God the Word suffered in flesh ? 4. 1.

O. Scripture does not say so. Peter says, "Christ."

E. Is not "Christ," think you, God the Word ?

O. "Christ" denotes the Word Incarnate. The phrase, "God the Word," in itself, denotes the Word as yet unincarnate <sup>c.</sup><sup>e</sup>."

E. But if God the Word, on becoming incarnate, was called Christ, there is nothing absurd, that I see, in the phrase, "God the Word suffered in flesh."

O. A very audacious attempt ! Consider : Scripture says God the Word is from God the Father.

E. True.

O. Yet it also says the Holy Spirit is likewise from God.

E. Granted.

O. And it calls God the Word "Only-begotten Son."

E. It does.

O. It never calls the Spirit so.

E. Never.

O. Yet the Spirit also has His existence from God the Father.

E. Yes.

O. Would you then venture to call Him a "Son ? "

E. By no means.

O. Why not ?

E. Because I do not find this phrase in Scripture <sup>d.</sup>

O. Would you call Him "begotten ? "

E. No.

O. Why not ?

E. I do not find this in Scripture.

O. What then should we call that which is not begotten nor made ?

E. Uncreated and unbegotten.

O. The Spirit was neither begotten nor made ; is it not so ?

E. He was neither begotten nor made.

O. Will you then call Him "unbegotten ? "

E. No.

O. Why not ?

E. Because I fear to say what Scripture does not say.

O. "Observe this reverential caution, my good friend, in regard to the Passion also." Scripture never says, "God" suffered.

<sup>c</sup> This is captions; the phrase, as used by Cyril, and indeed by "Eranistes," presumes the Incarnation.

<sup>d</sup> Athanasius meets an Arian question on this point by saying that as

the Father is the "only" Father, so the Son is the "only" Son, and therefore the Holy Spirit cannot be another Son, or "brother" of the Son, Ep. ad Serap. i. 16.

E. I do not say that God the Word suffered apart from a body<sup>e</sup>.

O. "You state the mode of suffering, not the impassibility." But who would say that Paul's soul died in flesh<sup>f</sup>? Even the souls of the wicked are impassible. How much more was the spotless soul of our Saviour immortal?

E. All this long argument is needless: I own that His soul was immortal.

O. How then can you call the Word's Divine essence mortal, or say that the Word suffered?

E. He suffered impassibly.

O. These are absurd paradoxes<sup>g</sup>. It is said by Paul, God "only hath immortality."

E. Why then call souls immortal?

O. God is properly, essentially, immortal: other beings are so by His grant. Could the Immortal One suffer?

E. After the Incarnation, I say, He "tasted death."

O. But we before agreed that He was immutable. It is perilous for those who contend against impiety even to utter such words as that He was changed from living into dead.

E. Cease to tax me with impiety. I say that the human, not the Divine nature suffered; or rather that the Divine suffered with the human<sup>h</sup>.

O. Do you mean that it felt the pain of crucifixion?

E. Yes.

O. But even a human soul does not feel corporeal pains. Or if we grant that it does thus sympathise with the body, this does not prove that the Godhead is other than impassible; for it is not joined to a body in place of a soul<sup>i</sup>. Do you admit that it assumed a soul?

E. I have often admitted it.

O. A rational soul, too?

E. Certainly<sup>k</sup>.

O. It was then this soul which "sympathised" with the body of Christ. It was the body which was offered up, the soul that was "troubled."

<sup>e</sup> Compare Ath. c. Apollin. ii. 14. Observe that Eranistes is not made to appeal to Acts 20. 28.

<sup>f</sup> The cases are not parallel; for whereas a human soul, when separated from the body, goes into Hades, the Divine Person of the Redeemer was present alike with His soul and body during the brief severance of the "vital union," as Theodoret admits further on: and see p. 135.

<sup>g</sup> Lit. "ridiculous riddles."

<sup>h</sup> An Apollinarian notion; see Greg. Nyss. *Antirrhēt.* c. 5, on the tendency of Apollinarii's treatise "on the Divinity of the Only-begotten" to represent the Divinity of the Only-begotten as mortal, and the impassible nature as changed so as to partake in suffering.

<sup>i</sup> As some Arians held, see c. Apollin. i. 15.

<sup>k</sup> Here the Eutychian is fairly represented as disowning the characteristic doctrine of Apollinarii.

E. Where does the Lord show that His body was offered ! Are you going to adduce the oft quoted “ Destroy this temple, &c. ? ” S. John 2. 19.

O. If you dislike the Divine words, why not erase them after the example of Marcion<sup>1</sup>? But if this seems to you too audacious, do not mock at them, but follow the Apostles who believed them in the sense stated.

E. Can you prove your point ?

O. Manna is compared to the true Food.

Ib. 6. 32.

E. I remember the text.

O. It is added, “ The bread is My flesh.”

Ib. 6. 51.

E. One instance is not enough.

O. You are unreasonable : the Ethiopian was content with one Acts 8. 36. text. But, when He ate the Paschal supper, Christ showed what that was to which the typical lamb pointed ; what was the “ body ” of which it was the “ shadow.”

E. I know that narrative.

O. Remember, then, what He took,—and what he called it.

E. “ On account of the uninitiated, I will speak with some reserve.” (repeats the words of Institution, in substance.)

O. Here, in “ exhibiting the type of His Passion,” He did not mention His Divinity, but His Body and Blood<sup>m</sup>.

E. True.

O. “ Body, therefore, it was that was crucified.”

E. So it seems.

O. When, after His Resurrection He entered where the doors were shut, how did He remove their fear ?

E. He said, “ Behold My hands and My feet.”

S. Luke

O. It was the body then, which He showed, and therefore which 24. 39. had risen.

E. Clearly.

O. That which had risen was that which had died on the cross ?

E. Certainly.

O. It was, then, the body that suffered.

E. “ The chain of argument compels one to say so.”

O. Look at it in another way also. What did the “ first of apostles ” say in his sermon, after the descent of the Holy Spirit ?

E. He adduced the promises made to David, and his predictive Acts 2. 29 ff. words; “ Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades,” &c.

O. Resurrection, then, belongs to flesh and soul.

<sup>1</sup> Marcion did not recognise any Gospel save an abbreviated form of S. Luke's.

<sup>m</sup> Cyril owns that if any one was to say that the Word had been changed

into the nature of a body, it would be reasonable to answer that Christ did not say, “ This is My Godhead ; ” adv. Nest. iv. 7.

E. How could a sane person talk of resurrection of a soul that never could die?

O. Lately you ascribed death to God: now you are suddenly become so "sane," that you will not ascribe resurrection to soul.

E. Because that which can rise must be that which has fallen<sup>n</sup>.

O. But body does not rise without soul: see the case of Lazarus.

E. That is clear.

Ezek. 37, 7 ff. O. So too Ezekiel saw the souls return to their own bodies.

E. True.

O. The Lord's body then, was not corrupted, but on the third day regained its own soul.

E. Granted.

O. Does Passion belong to the things to which death belongs?

E. Certainly.

O. Did not Peter and David speak both of soul and body?

E. Yes.

O. "It was not, then, the Godhead which died, but the body, by being severed from the soul."

E. "For my part I cannot endure this absurd language."

O. "You are attacking your own words."

E. "You wrong me altogether: not one of those words is mine."

O. If you ask a man what is that animal which is both rational and mortal, and he answers, "Man," which of them is it that interprets the word?

E. He who answers.

O. I was right then; these sayings are yours, by your assent.

1 Cor. 2, 8. E. Well, now I will ask, what of the text about "crucifying the Lord of glory<sup>o</sup>?" It says nothing of body or soul.

O. On that showing, you ought not to add "in flesh" when explaining it.

E. No, it was "in flesh" that He suffered: the incorporeal nature of itself could not suffer.

O. But one must not add to Paul's words.

E. But one may explain what his purport involves.

O. Provided, then, that we do not add to Scripture, there is nothing wrong in unfolding its purport.

E. Nothing.

Gal. 1, 19. O. Then let us inquire together:—as to "James the Lord's brother;"—was he brother of the Godhead or the Manhood?

E. I will not have the united natures divided.

<sup>n</sup> So Pearson, on the Creed, i. adv. Theod. 12. See on Athan. Ep. 645. Theodoret is evasive. <sup>o</sup> to Max. 1.

<sup>o</sup> Cited against Theodoret by Cyril,

O. You have often enough divided them<sup>p</sup>. Do you call God the Word "Only-begotten Son?"

E. I do.

O. And Only-begotten means "only?"

E. Yes.

O. And who is Only-begotten cannot have a brother.

E. He cannot.

O. Then the Only Son cannot have a brother; therefore James is not the Lord's brother.

E. But the Lord had a body,—so that Scripture speaks of other properties in Him than those which belong to Godhead. James was His kinsman according to flesh.

O. Again you introduce the "division," which you censure.

E. It was necessary, in order to establish the relationship.

O. Then do not blame me for doing the like.

E. You are trying to evade the point.

O. Not at all: I am coming to it. Consider: James, you say, was brother according to flesh only. Apply to the Passion the rule which you follow as to relationships; distinguish in the one case, as in the other. "I too believe that the Crucified One is Lord of glory. For the body crucified was not that of a common man, but of the Lord of glory."<sup>q</sup> But "the union makes the names common." You own that His flesh was not from heaven, but from Mary?<sup>r</sup>

E. I do.

O. Why, then, did He say, "the Son of Man ascending up S. John where He was before," or "the Son of Man who is in heaven?"<sup>6. 62.</sup> <sup>fb. 3. 13.</sup>

E. That is spoken, not of the flesh, but of the Godhead.

O. But the Godhead is from God the Father: why then is He here called Son of Man?

E. "The properties of the natures belong alike to the Person<sup>s</sup>. On account of the union, the Self-same is Son of Man and Son of God Son of David and Lord of David."

O. Quite right. But it is also true, that the community of names involves no confusion of natures. We have therefore to consider how He is Son of God and also Son of Man. The Godhead it was, you say, that descended from heaven: and it is called Son of Man because of the union. So too, the flesh was crucified: but the Godhead was never separated from flesh, either on the Cross or in the

<sup>p</sup> I. e. "divided enough for my purpose, by distinguishing between their properties."

<sup>q</sup> Exactly what Cyril would have said.

<sup>r</sup> As against the opinion of some followers of Apollinaris; see above, p. 80; comp. p. 47.

<sup>s</sup> Κανὰ τοῦ προσώπου γέγονε. See p. 172.

sepulchre<sup>t</sup>, while it never felt suffering, being impassible. So “the Lord of glory was crucified :” the name of the impassible nature is ascribed to the possible, because it was called the body of the latter. The very text shows it. The “princes” crucified the nature which they knew, not that of which they knew nothing<sup>u</sup>.

E. This seems probable. But the Nicene Fathers say that “Very God” suffered.

O. You have forgotten what you have often admitted, that after the union, Scripture ascribes both the lofty and the lowly (attributes) to one Person. And the Nicene Creed had prefixed “was incarnate, and made man” to “suffered.”

E. But they said that “the Son” who was “from the Father’s essence” suffered and was crucified.

O. I have often said that what is Divine and what is human belong alike to the one Person. Accordingly, the Fathers, intending to tribute both Divinity and Humanity<sup>x</sup> to the one Person, used the word “Christ,” which takes in both: yet we still distinguish what belongs to one nature from what belongs to the other: e. g. the expressions, “from the Father’s essence,” “very God from very God,” and “coessential,” refer to the Godhead, do they not?

E. Clearly so.

O. Similarly then, the Passion must be attributed to the humanity, not to the Divinity. And the anathemas at the end of the Creed involve the Divine impassibility<sup>y</sup>.

E. They were then speaking of change.

O. Is not Passion “change?” If after the Incarnation He suffered, He was certainly “changed.” Such an idea the Fathers cast out and cut off. I will show you other Fathers who thought so.

E. I shall be very glad to hear their doctrines.

O. (cites sixteen writers, Ignatius, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Eustathius, Athanasius [Ep. Epict. 2, 6, 10. Serm. Major, 2, 3, 4, and another passage; de Incarn. et e. Ari. 2; de Incarn. Verbi, 9, 20], Damasus, Ambrose, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Amphilochius, Flavian, Theophilus, Gelasius of Caesarea, Chrysostom, Severianus: then observes that) Easterns and Westerns, Northerns and Southerns, Greeks and Latins, agree in affirming the impassibility of the Divine nature.

E. I admire their agreement, but I see what a broad distinction they draw.

<sup>t</sup> See on S. Ath. c. Apoll. ii. 14.

<sup>u</sup> But on this showing, the phrase, “God the Word suffered in flesh,” is quite as justifiable.

<sup>x</sup> Θεολογίας—οἰκειότητος.

<sup>y</sup> He ignores the “Constantinopolitan” recension of the Creed, even as his party had done in 431, Mansi, iv. 1376. So Cyril, adv. Nest. i. 8. See Lumby, Hist. of Creeds, p. 77.

O. Do not be surprised at that: reaction against one extreme tends to another. Husbandmen pull a plant into an opposite direction, after they see it growing crooked<sup>2</sup>. But I will quote Apollinaris himself, as maintaining the impassibility of the Divine nature, and restricting the Passion to the body. (Reads several passages from the "Compendium," to the effect that the Lord is not "circumscribed" by His union with the body,—that what rose again was the body, that in the sufferings of His body His power retained its own impassibility, &c.)

E. I am surprised, and ashamed to think that my opinions are more objectionable than his heresy.

O. I will produce another witness from a different band of heretics, Eusebius of Emesa near Lebanon.

E. I have met with some of his writings, and found him to be an Arian<sup>a</sup>.

O. He was; but while denying the coequality, he asserts the Divinity of the Son (whom he regards as inferior), to be impassible: and for this opinion he went through many contests. (He reads from Eusebius of Emesa.)

E. I admire the man's thoughts and conceptions.

O. Do you then imitate the bees, and suck honey of true doctrine amid the meadows of Scripture, and the flowers of the Fathers. When you find something good for making honey in such bad herbage as that of Apollinaris or Eusebius, make use of it, and pass over what is noxious. Take my friendly advice:—but if you will not, I shall say with Paul, "I am clean."

Acts 18  
6.

<sup>a</sup> Lit. "they not only raise it up to the right standard (*κανόνα*) but even bend it in the opposite direction, beyond what is straight."

<sup>a</sup> Soc. ii. 9. Soz. iii. 6. Jerome de Vir. Illustr. 91. He refused to be the Arian bishop of Alexandria, and Gregory of Cappadocia was elected in his place. But he accepted the see of Emesa, and after overcoming the suspicion of magical practices, held it

until his death, which is dated before the end of 359. Jerome says he was a "person of graceful and oratorical ability, who wrote numberless books of a sort to win popular applause, which are eagerly read by would-be declaimers—such as his treatises against Jews, Heathens, Novatians, &c., and to the Galatians, and many short homilies on the Gospels." Cf. Dict. Chr. Biogr. ii. 358.

# INDEX I.

## OF SUBJECTS.

---

### A

*Abraham and Isaac*, 218.  
*Acacius*, the, 22, 96.  
*Acacius of Berea*, 170.  
*Acacius of Melitene*, 172.  
*Adam*, fall of, 36, 92, 123.  
*Adam*, "the Second," 93, 129, 218.  
"Advance in virtue," Christ not Son of God by, 108.  
*Adelphius*, bishop of Onuphis, 61.  
*Adoption*, Christ not Son of God by, 22, 99.  
*Actius*, 30, 35.  
*Agathodæmon*, bishop, 14.  
*Agapetus*, deacon, 14.  
*Agathus*, bishop, 14.  
*Alexander of Hierapolis*, ultra-Nestorian, 170, 175.  
*Alexandria*, Council of, 1.  
*Ambrose*, S., quoted, 46, 53, 73, 89, 90, 96, 97.  
*Ammonius*, bishop, 14.  
*Anatolius*, bishop, 13.  
*Anathematisms* or Articles of Cyril, the, 157.  
*Andrew*, bishop of Arsenois, 14.  
*Andrew*, bishop of Samosata, opposed to Cyril, 158, 170.  
*Angels*, cannot see Divine essence, 181: some transgressed, 36.  
*Anointing of Christ*, 118.  
*Anomœans*, the, 28, 35, 113.  
"Anomœon," the, 22.  
*Antiochene* school, tendency of, 150, 165.  
*Antioch*, councils of, 6, 10, 113.  
*Apollinarianism*, 14, 16, 43, 78: propositions of, 81: injurious to vital Christianity, 81, 88, 113.  
*Apollinaris*, bishop, 2, 78: origin of his errors, 79: admissions by, 138, 209, 227: other language of, quoted, 11, 17, 79, 87, 120.  
"Appropriation" of human conditions by the Son, 137, 162, 173.  
*Aphthartodocetæ*, the, 56.  
*Arcadia*, 155.  
*Arianus*, opinions of, 19, 31: their worship of the Son idolatrous in principle, 63, 70, 155: because they deem His Godhead merely titular, 33, 119: deny an animal soul to exist in Christ, 103, 106, 119, 191: called "Ariomaniacs," 4, 69, 71: sections of, 35.

*Ariminum*, Council of, 25, 28, 37, 38.  
*Artemon*, denied Christ's Divinity, 191.  
*Ascension of Christ*, 91.  
*Association*, Nestorian idea of an, 64.  
*Assumption* of flesh, by the Word, 55, 181, 197.  
*Asterius*, Arian, 31.  
*Asterius*, bishop, 13.  
*Athanasius*, S., brave fidelity of, 17: theological greatness and comprehensiveness of, 118: considerateness of, 10, 77: Cyril professes to follow absolutely, 173: other writings of, quoted, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 20, 22, 32, 35, 36, 37, 41, 42, 52, 71, 77, 91, 102, 108, 112, 113, 118, 121, 194, 196, 221.  
*Attempts* of heretics to go beyond what is revealed, 111.  
*Augustine*, S., quoted, 37, 80, 96, 118.  
*Auxentius*, Arian bishop, 24, 23, 40, 45.

### B

*Basil*, S., quoted, 10, 18, 19, 22, 37, 39, 50, 54, 78, 81, 84, 115, 163.  
*Basil of Seleucia*, 198.  
*Basilides*, 6, 10.  
*Birth of Christ*, supernatural, 74.  
*Blood* of Christ effectual for salvation, 108.  
*Body* of Christ, not coessential with Godhead, 46: the "body of God," 64, 97, 111, 135: "of the Word," 52, 74, 91, 137: importance of, in regard to our salvation, 66: a temple of God, 69: naturally mortal, 56: not "corrupted," 104: Apollinarians dislike to acknowledge, 97: so Eutychians, 186: indescribable glory of, 115: shown as real after resurrection, 52, 205.  
*British Church*, orthodox, 20.

### C

*Caius*, Arian bishop, 45.  
*Calmerus*, deacon, 14.  
*Captions* *question* put by Apollinarians, as by Arians, 140.  
*Celestine*, Pope, on Nestorius's position, 155.  
*Chalcedon*, Council of, quoted, 98, 106, 171.  
*Change*, created beings subject to, 36: impossible for the Word to undergo,

16, 52, 132, 181 : old Arian error on this point, 75.

*Christ*, the One, both God and Man, 98, 103, 122, 141, 167, 171 : title of, implies both Godhead and Manhood, 102.

*Chrysostom*, S., quoted, 181.

“*Circumscription*,” characteristic of a created being, 205.

“*Communicatio idiomatum*,” 59, 200.

*Communion* with Christ, real, 88.

*Condescension*, the, of the Son, 169.

“*Confusion*,” the “union” without, 96.

*Constantinople*, Arian Council of, 40.

*Constantius*, 29.

*Conversion* of Godhead into flesh, a heretical idea, 16, 46, 49, 54, 86, 122.

*Council*, Fifth Ecumenical, 153, 164, 167, 175 : Sixth, 123, 128.

*Councils*, various, of the Arians, 26, 40.

*Creature*, Arians call the Son a, 18, 31.

*Creature-worship*, disowned, 63.

*Curse*, how Christ “became a,” 55.

*Cymatius*, bishop, 3.

*Cyril*, S., of Alexandria, described, 149 : third letter to Nestorius, 108, 156, 181 : “twelve articles” of, 157 : explanatory writings of, 74, 75, 108, 158, 174 : letter of to John of Antioch, 12, 173 : death of, 176 : other writings of, quoted, 9, 11, 12, 47, 50, 52, 54, 55, 58, 63, 64, 73, 87, 88, 92, 99, 100, 126, 137, 149, 150, 153, 155, 159, 162, 174, 175, 176, 190, 196, 204, 210, 211, 223.

*Cyril*, S., of Jerusalem, 207.

**D**

*Damasus*, bishop of Rome, 5, 6, 23, 40, 81, 211.

*Death*, how inherited by Adam’s posterity, and how defeated by Christ’s resurrection, 217 : Christ’s alone atoning, 59.

*Demophilus*, Arian bishop, 28, 204.

*Dialogues* of Theodoret, when and why composed, 177.

*Diodore*, bishop of Tarsus, 151, 176, 188.

*Dionysius*, bishop of Alexandria, 14, 34.

*Dionysius*, bishop of Rome, 33, 34.

*Dioscorius*, bishop of Alexandria, supports Eutyches, 176, 198 : denounces Theodoret, 178.

“*Disciplina arcana*,” the, 184, 207, 223.

*Division*, Apollinarians professedly dread, 120 : involved in Nestorianism, 153.

*Docetism*, 54, 63, 76, 87.

*Domnus*, bishop of Antioch, 178.

*Doxology*, forms of the, 42.

*Dracontius*, bishop, 3.

**E**

“*East*, the,” sense of, 20.

*Ebionites*, 108.

*Egypt*, Christ’s visit to, 76.

“*Emmanuel*,” sense of the word, 59, 67, 159.

*Ephesus*, Council of, seventh canon of, 7.

*Epictetus*, bishop of Corinth, 45 : letter referred to in Nestorian controversy, 170, 172.

*Epiphanius*, S., quoted, 9, 11, 15, 20, 36, 64, 73, 80, 81, 108, 109, 113, 118.

*Equivocation*, employed by heretics, 11, 81.

“*Essence*,” sense of, 30, 179.

*Eucharist*, the Holy, argument from to the Divinity of Christ’s Person, 74, 168 : to the distinctness of His Manhood, 208.

*Eudoxius*, Arian bishop, 28.

*Eudoxia*, 155.

*Eusebians*, trickery of, at Nicæa, 32.

*Eusebius*, bishop of Cæsarea, quoted, 10, 34, 41, 205.

*Eusebius*, bishop of Emesa, 227.

*Eusebius*, bishop of Vercellæ, 2 : statement by, 14.

*Eustathius*, the, 5.

*Eutherius*, 163.

*Eutyches*, 176, 189, 196, 199.

“*Exhibition*,” Apollinarian idea of, 84, 101.

**F**

*Faith*, operation of, 130.

*Faithful*, the, to be taught how to defend the truth, 195.

*Father*, the cause of the Son, 194 : fountain of the Godhead, 56.

“*Fire and iron*,” relation between, compared to that of Godhead and Manhood in Christ, 204.

*Flavian*, bishop of Constantinople, council held by, 198.

*Flesh*, Christ’s, not uncreated, 86 : nor coeternal, 89 : nor heavenly in origin, 92 : nor coessential, 96 : essential to our redemption, 67 : Christ to be adored in, 64 : “suffering in,” ascribed by Cyril to God the Word, 169 : how the Word “became,” 180 : man sometimes called, 55, 141, 190.

“*Form of God*” and “*of a servant*,” 89, 116.

*Free-will* in man, 123.

“*From two natures*,” 198.

**G**

*Genealogy* of Christ, in the Gospels, 26, 94, 132, 200.

*Glorification*, in what sense possible for the Son, 136.

*God*, as such, could not suffer, 133 : name of, Arians misuse, 131.

*Godhead*, one, in the Trinity, 22 : of Christ, inseparable from His body and His soul, 67, 111, 135.

*Gregory, S.*, of Nazianzus, quoted, 10, 11, 55, 57, 63, 84, 85, 90, 91, 92, 99, 105, 106, 138.  
*Gregory, S.*, of Nyssa, quoted, 92, 99, 105, 111, 126, 138, 222.

## H

*Hades*, souls detained in, 101, 128: released from, 139: Christ went into by His soul, 111, 138.

“*Heavenly Man*,” how Christ is, 137.  
 “*Heavenly Mind*,” true sense of, 103.

*Hebrews*, Epistle to, ascribed to S. Paul, 30, 51, 88, 184.

*Herennius*, deacon, 13.

*Heresy*, downward course of, 62.

*Hierax*, presbyter, 71.

*High Priest*, God the Word became our, as Man, 125, 166: Christ a, after the order of Melchisedec, 194.

*Hilary*, S. quoted, 10, 18, 20, 22, 26, 58, 72, 75, 98, 108, 114, 140.

*Holy Spirit*, the uncreated, 9, 16: Divinity of, implied in the original Nicene Creed, 11: not operating on Christ ab extra, 165: Cyril and Theodore on procession of, 166: not a Son, nor begotten, 221.

“*Homoion*,” sense of the, 22, 35.

“*Homoioiōn*,” the, 19.

“*Homoiousion*,” sense of the, 19, 22, 37, 39: why adopted at Nicaea, 33, 96.

*Humanity*, in entirety, fallen and restored, 90, 105: why Apollinaris denied that Christ took the whole of, 85.

“*Hypostasis*,” use of the word, 7—10, 15, 21, 30, 100, 175, 179.

*Hypostatic Union*, doctrine of the, 150.

## I

*Ibas*, bishop of Edessa, a Nestorianiser, 176.

*Ignatius*, S., 163, 188.

*Image of the Father*, the Son called, 32.

*Images of the Emperor*, 193.

*Imitation*, Apollinarian theory of, 86, 113.

*Impossible to God*, some things, because He is all-perfect, 213.

“*In two natures*,” 198.

*Inarnation*, doctrine of the, 113, 122, 152: virtually denied by Nestorius, 153.

“*Indian*” Christians, 25.

*Infirmities*, human, felt by our Lord as Man, 215.

“*Instrumental*,” Apollinarian use of, 84.

*Inward man*, the soul is the, 103.

*Irenaeus*, bishop of Tyre, a Nestorianiser, 176.

*Irenaeus*, S. quoted, 207.

*Ianuarii*, Council in, (Selenitan) 40.

## J

*Jerome*, S. quoted, 28, 78, 227.

*John*, bishop of Antioch, 157, 173.

*Jorian*, letter of, to Athanasius, 17.

## K

*Knowledge*, pretence of, among Gnostics, 111.

## L

*Lux quotatim*, specimens of, 52, 126.

*Lazarus*, raised up by Christ the God-Man, 11, 75.

*Leo the Great*, S. quoted, 2, 12, 73, 76, 178, 180, 187, 195, 197, 199, 202, 215.

*Leontius*, 79, 80, 87, 89, 106, 174, 186.

*Likeness of the Son to the Father*, not merely moral, 35.

*Logic*, human, relied on by heresies, 81.

*Logomachy*, to be avoided, 21, 73.

*Lucifer*, bishop of Caliaris, 2, 3, 13, 15.

## M

*Macedonian heresy*, the, 5.

*Macrostich* creed, the, 25, 108, 125.

*Magi*, Christ adored by, 76.

*Man*, Apollinarians loth to own Christ to be, 97: and Entyehians, 190: He will be for ever, 118.

*Man-worshipping*, imputed by Apollinarians to Catholics, 63, 120.

*Manhood*, of Christ, distinct from His Godhead, and so recognised by Cyril, 160: not absorbed, 204.

*Manicheism*, 10, 55, 76, 87, 101, 106, 115, 119, 125, 141, 191.

*Marcellianism*, 9, 60.

*Marcellian*, 62, 101, 112, 119, 121, 125, 132, 141.

*Marina*, 155.

*Marius Mercator*, 107, 154, 159, 160.

*Mark*, bishop, 14.

*Mark*, another, bishop, 14.

*Mary*, the B. V., office of, as to the Incarnation, 47, 50, 75: called “God’s Mother,” 87, 101, 171, 178: Ever-Virgin, 88.

*Materialising* phrases, applied by Arians to Catholic doctrine, 114.

*Maximus*, Christian philosopher, 72.

*Maximus*, deacon, 14.

*Mediator*, how Christ the, 192.

*Melchisedec*, 193.

*Memory*, sample of a quotation from, 91.

*Men* of all classes united in Christ, 187.

*Menander*, 191.

*Menas*, bishop, 14.

*Messianic* sense of Psalms, 186.

*Milan*, church of, 40.

*Mind*, the human, primarily involved in

the Fall, 105: really assumed by the Word, 11, 16, 107: without involving any sinfulness, 123: Apollinarian objections to this truth, 79: in men incapable of renewal through mere 'imitation,' 113.  
 "Monarchia," principle of the, 57.  
 Monks, 14.  
 Monothelite controversy, the, 128.  
 Moral union with God, 35.

## N

*Nativity*, the, real, 51: supernatural, 74.  
 "Natural," how applied to Christ's birth and death, 92.  
 "Necessity," used for the "law of sin," 127.  
*Nestorianism*, 11, 43, 153.  
*Nestorius*, anathematisms of, 159; sermons of, 68, 153.  
*Nicæ*, in Thrace, Arian creed of, 40, 113.  
*Nicene Council*, occasion of the, 27.  
*Nicene Creed*, the text of, 20: inviolable and sufficient, 7, 13, 77: represents the faith of primitive saints, 18, 38: generally accepted, 20: explained away by some, 19: value of, 41: Constantinopolitan recension of, 5, 20, 226.  
*Noetians*, the, 118.  
*Non-Scriptural terms*, Acacian Arians reject, 22, 33.

## O

"Old City," in Antioch, Meletius's adherents assembled in, 5.  
 "One adoration," 69, 164.  
 "One incarnate nature," of God the Word, explained, 174.  
 "One nature after the Union," Eutychian phrase, 198.  
*Oneness* of Christ, admitted by the "Easterns," 164, and by Theodore, 178, 199.  
 "Operation, Theandric," 200.  
*Origen*, quoted, 65, 213.  
*Over-defining* deprecated, 102.

## P

*Paphnutius*, bishop, 14.  
 "Paradoxes of the Incarnation," 53.  
*Paris*, Council of, 24.  
*Paschal* question, the, 27.  
*Passion* of Christ, efficacious through His Divinity, 75.  
*Patriarchs*, the Jewish, 187.  
*Paul*, bishop of Emesa, 171.  
*Paul* of Samosata, heresy of, 6, 9, 76, 119, 141.  
*Paulinus* of Antioch, 5: profession of faith by, 15.  
*Pelagianism*, 127.  
*Perfect*, Godhead and Manhood in Christ, 108.

"*Perfектi*, two," objections as to, 79, 85, 103.

*Personality* of Christ, single, 11, 43: Divine, 69, 85, 97, 109, 152.  
*Polemon*, Apollinarian, 82, 174.

*Photinus*, heresy of, 10, 16, 60, 112.  
 "Pope," title of, 14.  
 "Potentate," Manichean myth about the, 125.

*Procession* of the Holy Spirit, 166.  
*Proclus*, quoted, 116, 131, 140, 181, 183, 211.

"Principle," one, of the Godhead, 9.  
*Prophets*, relation of the Word to, 11, 47, 58, 74.

*Properties*, Divine and human in Christ, distinct, yet attached to His one Person, 59, 172, 226.

*Pulcheria*, 155.

## Q

*Qualities*, not existing in God, 37.  
*Quaternity*, notion of a, falsely imputed to Catholics, 47, 56, 96, 101: disclaimed by Cyril, 172.

"*Quicunque vult*," the, language resembling, 22, 46, 85, 108, 129, 171.

## R

*Reconciliation*, the, of God to man, 104.  
*Redemption*, effected by Christ, 112: implies a Divine Redeemer, 170, 211.  
*Resurrection* of Christ, how a warrant of ours, 110, 220.

*Reunion*, formulary of the, 171.

*Reverence*, misguided, in heretics, 75, 95, 135, 192.  
*Rhetorius*, 90.

## S

*Sabellianism*, 6, 9, 114, 120, 191.  
*Sacrifice*, of Christ, 53, 75, 112.  
*Saints*, relation of the Word to, 10, 11, 74: buried in churches, 219.

*Sardica*, Council of, framed no creed, 7.  
*Satan*, author of sin, 106, 123.

*Saviour*, a, must be Divine, 70.  
*Scripture*, clearly supports Catholic faith, 18: cited as verifying it, 218: reading of, necessary, 196.

*Semi-Arians*, 22, 32.

"*Shepherd*," the, quoted, 32.

*Simon Magus*, 191.

*Simplicity* of Divine nature, 38.

*Sin*, not part of man's original nature, 105: how introduced, 123; wholly absent from Christ, 92, 109, 129.

*Sirmium*, creeds of, 16, 26, 40, 119.

*Socrates*, quoted, 10.

*Son of God*, Christ the genuine, 22, 39; and inseparable from the Father as to Godhead, 71, 118; in becoming Man, continued to be God, 118.

*Sonship*, reality of the Divine, the question at issue, 22, 39.

*Soul*, described as single, not double, 105, 189, 203: and flesh, in man, comparison drawn from, 161, 201: man sometimes called, 190: a rational, ascribed to Christ in Scripture, 107, 140: but not as preexistent, 55.

*Sozomen*, quoted, 79, 184.

“*Spirit*,” used for Godhead, 91.

*Successus*, Cyril’s letters to, 161, 174.

*Suffering*, predicate of God the Word as Man, 169, 210: impossible for Him as God, 53, 99, 210, 214: ascribed by Arians to His “Godhead,” 132.

*Sulpicius Severus*, 29.

*Symbolism*, in the Old Testament, 219.

*Sympathy*, human, of our Lord, 132, 141.

**T**

*Temptation* of Christ, the, 127.

*Theodore*, of Mopsuestia, 150, 153, 161, 176, 178, 186, 188.

*Theodore*, career of, 149: attacks Cyril’s Articles, 158: peculiar position of, after the Reunion, 175: attacked by Entychian party, 177: professes his belief in the oneness of Christ, 60, 178: Dialogues of, 177: other writings of, quoted, 17, 60, 79, 165, 180, 182, 186, 188, 193, 205, 211, 213, 214, 216.

*Theodosius II.*, 172, 176.

*Theodosius*, denied Christ’s Divinity, 191.

*Theophanies*, in the Old Testament, not manifestations of the Divine essence, 181.

*Theophilus*, quoted, 92.

“*Theophorus*,” sense of, 163.

“*Theotocos*,” the title, true sense of, 87, 150: assailed by Nestorians, 161.

*Thomas*, S. confession of, 58, 74.

*Tradition*, 62, 67, 113, 115.

*Timothy*, Apollinarian, 81, 89.

*Trinity*, the Holy, one Godhead in, 22, 57: in one Godhead, 15: coessential, 96: perfect and undivided, 56.

*Trouble*, felt by Christ’s soul, 89, 107.

“*Two Natures*” not equivalent to “*Two Sons*,” 201.

“*Two Sons*,” disclaimed by Theodoret, 182.

“*Types*,” relation of to archetypes or originals, 193.

**U**

“*Union*,” the personal, identified with the Incarnation, 197: indissoluble, 111, 117, 122, 135.

*Unity*, to be promoted among those who are really agreed in faith, 12.

*Ursacius*, Arian bishop, 23, 28, 40.

**V**

*Valens*, Arian bishop of Mursa, 23, 24, 28, 40.

*Valentinus*, Gnostic, 6, 62, 99, 132, 141.

*Valentinus*, Apollinarian, 89.

*Valerian*, Cyril’s letter to, 161, 174.

*Veil*, Christ’s flesh a, for His Godhead, 184.

*Vincent* of Lerius, 171.

*Vitalis*, 11, 81, 82.

**W**

*Water* and blood, from Christ’s side, 111.

*Will* of Christ, His sufferings dependent on, 92, 109: in what sense restricted by Athanasius to His Godhead, 128.

*Word*, the, identical with the Son, 60: Maker of the universe 31, 93: became Man, 113.

*Worship*, due to the Son as Incarnate, 64: offered to Christ as to One Divine Person, 69, 91, 164.

**Z**

*Zoilus*, bishop, 14.

INDEX II.  
OF GREEK WORDS.

---

A.

Ἄκρα ἔνωσις, 117, 204, 214.  
ἄνθρωπος, 135, 146.  
ἄνθρωπος Κυριακός, 145.  
ἀντίτυπος, 207.  
ἄνυπόστατος, 9, 138, 197.  
ἀρχέτυπος, 88, 122, 207.  
ἀρχή, 9.  
ἀσυγχύτος, 97, 167.  
ἀφροσύνη, 37.

D.

διπλοῦς, 98.  
δόκησις, 54, 84, 86, 107, 122, 132, 180.  
δημιουργός, 47, 93.

E.

εἶδος, 118.  
ἐπισπείρας, 123.  
ἐξουσιαστής, 125.  
ἐργεία, 117, 202.  
ἔνωσις, 154.  
ἐνούσιος, 9.  
ἔνσαρκος παρουσία, 62.  
ἐνυπόστατος, 9.  
ἐνσεβεία, 12, 25.

Θ.

θεολογία, 10, 226.  
θεολογεῖσθαι, 63, 141.  
θεοποιεῖν, 66.  
θεοτόκος, 87, 101, 102, 178.  
θεοφόρος, 91, 188.  
θέσις, 46, 109.

I.

ἰδικῶς, 153.  
ἰδιοποιεῖσθαις, 52, 100.  
ἰδιότης, 180.

K.

καταχρηστικῶς, 103.  
κένωσις, 65, 162.  
κήρυγμα, 98.  
κυνός, 108.

M.

μοναρχία, 9.  
μονότροπος, 123.  
μορφή, 104, 116.  
μυστήριον, 122.  
μυστικώτερον, 184.

N.

νοῦς, 11, 79, 189.  
οἰκειοῦσθαι, 52, 137, 173.  
οἰκονομεῖν, 173, 210.  
οἰκονομία, 10, 86, 126, 226.  
ὅμοιον, 22.  
ὅμοιόσιον, 19.  
ὅνομάζω, 6, 27.  
ὅρος, 121.  
οὐσία, 9, 179.

Π.

παροικία, 5.  
πίστις, 7.  
προκοπή, 108.  
πρόσωπον, 117, 129, 161, 175, 180, 216,  
219, 225.  
πρωτόπλαστος, 89, 94.

Σ.

σύγκρασις, 138.  
σύμβόλον, 215.  
σύναξις, 13.  
συνάφεια, 79, 120, 126, 154.  
σύνθετος, 37.  
σχετικός, 154.

Τ.

τέλεια, 85.  
τρεπτός, 75, 79.  
τροπή, 50, 75.  
τύπος, 215.

Τ.

ὑπαρξία, 30, 93, 126.  
ὑπόστασις, 7, 34, 160, 175, 179, 197.

Φ.

φαντασία, 76, 87, 107, 191, 215.  
φύσις, 59, 109, 123, 124, 128, 174, 175,  
193, 197.

Χ.

χαρακτῆρ, 41, 193.

Ψ.

ψυχή, 79, 111, 117, 189.  
ψυχικός, 57.

## INDEX III.

### OF TEXTS.

GENESIS.		ex. 1 . . . . .	136
ii. 17 . . . . .	212	4 . . . . .	86
18 . . . . .	104	cxv. 4 . . . . .	45
21 . . . . .	88		
iii. 19 . . . . .	75, 101		
vi. 3 . . . . .	190		
viii. 21 . . . . .	126	xxi. 1 . . . . .	18
xii. 3 . . . . .	183	xxii. 14 . . . . .	114
xxii. 16 . . . . .	218	28 . . . . .	25
xlii. 27 . . . . .	190		
xlix. 10 . . . . .	184		
EXODUS.		ii. 3 . . . . .	46
iii. 14 . . . . .	30	vi. 1 . . . . .	206
vii. 1 . . . . .	192	vii. 13 . . . . .	95
xii. 41 . . . . .	33	14 . . . . .	51
xxi. 17 . . . . .	25	16 . . . . .	124
LEVITICUS.		viii. 1 . . . . .	131
xiv. 51 . . . . .	219	xi. 1 . . . . .	187
xvi. 8, 9 . . . . .	219	xxxii. 6 . . . . .	63
DEUTERONOMY.		xl. 28 . . . . .	134
iv. 24 . . . . .	133	1. 6 . . . . .	53
xvi. 16 . . . . .	68	liii. 3 . . . . .	134
xviii. 18, 28 . . . . .	133	12 . . . . .	137
1 SAMUEL.		lv. 1 . . . . .	187
ix. 18 . . . . .	214	lxiii. 1 . . . . .	129
PSALMS.			
xiv. 1 . . . . .	30		
xvi. 10 . . . . .	111, 135		
xxxiv. 13 . . . . .	73		
xxxvi. 9 . . . . .	33		
xliii. 3 . . . . .	67	xviii. 4 . . . . .	112, 190
xlii. 7 . . . . .	33	xxxvii. 7 . . . . .	224
xlii. 8 . . . . .	124		
lxv. 2 . . . . .	190		
lxviii. 19, 20 . . . . .	127		
lxxxv. 8 . . . . .	36		
lxxxvii. 3 . . . . .	121	viii. 7 . . . . .	27
lxxxix. 4 . . . . .	190	xii. 10 . . . . .	184
LAMENTATIONS.			
iii. 28 . . . . .	83		
EZEKIEL.			
xviii. 4 . . . . .	112, 190		
xxxvii. 7 . . . . .	224		
HOSEA.			
viii. 7 . . . . .	27		
xii. 10 . . . . .	184		

JOEL.	xxviii. 9 . . . . .	91
ii. 25 : : : : : 33		
28 : : : : : 55		
AMOS.	S. MARK.	
vii. 12 . . . . . 214	viii. 31 : : : : : 132	
MICAH.	xv. 5 : : : : : 72	
v. 2 . . . . . 183		
HABAKKUK.	S. LUKE.	
ii. 15 . . . . . 12, 46, 121	i. 27 . . . . . 51	
ZECHARIAH.	ii. 7 . . . . . 51	
vii. 10 . . . . . 206	23 . . . . . 51	
MALACHI.	25 . . . . . 88, 203	
iii. 6 . . . . . 52, 180	iii. 38 . . . . . 116	
BARUCH.	x. 22 . . . . . 134	
iii. 35, 37 . . . . . 183	xi. 27 . . . . . 51	
WISDOM.	xxiii. 45 . . . . . 68	
ii. 23, 24 . . . . . 93, 105, 128	46 . . . . . 138	
S. MATTHEW.	xxiv. 39, 40 . . . . . 54, 19, 196, 205	
i. 1 . . . . . 97	S. JOHN.	
23 . . . . . 58, 67	i. 1 . . . . . 70, 97, 113, 116, 199	
25 . . . . . 113	3 . . . . . 31	
iii. 17 . . . . . 60	14 . . . . . 15, 55, 63, 75, 180	
iv. 3 . . . . . 128	ii. 19 . . . . . 137, 164, 223	
v. 48 . . . . . 36	iii. 13 . . . . . 225	
viii. 2 . . . . . 64	31 . . . . . 34	
15 . . . . . 69	iv. 6 . . . . . 215	
26 . . . . . 64	24 . . . . . 91, 94	
ix. 6 . . . . . 93	v. 19 . . . . . 36	
20 . . . . . 64	27 . . . . . 93	
x. 28 . . . . . 103, 126, 139	vi. 32 . . . . . 223	
32 . . . . . 95	51 . . . . . 223	
xiii. 25 . . . . . 106	62 . . . . . 225	
xvii. 5 . . . . . 60	viii. 31, 36 . . . . . 94, 114	
xviii. 10 . . . . . 184	40 . . . . . 74, 192	
xxi. 27 . . . . . 200	44 . . . . . 115, 121	
xxii. 42 . . . . . 195	56 . . . . . 218	
xxiv. 2 . . . . . 68	58 . . . . . 11, 201	
xxv. 31 . . . . . 97	ix. 6 . . . . . 12, 64	
xxvii. 19, 39, 40 . . . . . 73, 110	x. 15 . . . . . 111, 139	
50 . . . . . 111	30 . . . . . 135	
51 . . . . . 65	32 ff . . . . . 33, 134, 215	
54 . . . . . 74	33 . . . . . 195	
xxviii. 6 . . . . . 219	35 . . . . . 64	
	xi. 34 . . . . . 36	
	xii. 24 . . . . . 11	
	27 . . . . . 185	
	28 . . . . . 107, 109, 203, 222	
	xiii. 21 . . . . . 136	
	xiv. 6 . . . . . 107, 139	
	xiv. 6 . . . . . 111, 130	
	9 . . . . . 35, 215	
	20 . . . . . 106	
	30 . . . . . 129	
	xv. 1 . . . . . 184	
	xvi. 14 . . . . . 194	
	15 . . . . . 36	
	33 . . . . . 108, 128	
	xvii. 4 . . . . . 136	
	24 . . . . . 67	
	xviii. 22 . . . . . 53	
	xix. 30 . . . . . 111, 138	

xx. 17	91	GALATIANS.
28	58, 74	
		i. 7 . . . . . 86
		19 . . . . . 224
ACTS.		iii. 13 . . . . . 219
i. 11	67	15 . . . . . 55
ii. 22	192	20 . . . . . 99
29	223	iv. 1 . . . . . 65, 126
31	110	24 . . . . . 219
36	127	
vii. 53	67	EPHESIANS.
viii. 36	223	
xxvi. 23	117	ii. 2 . . . . . 69
		10 . . . . . 112
ROMANS.		19 . . . . . 100
i. 1	121	iii. 6 . . . . . 122
3	60, 134, 188	iv. 22 . . . . . 109
21	65	24 . . . . . 90, 109
30	62	v. 2 . . . . . 166
v. 11	106	30 . . . . . 102
12	110, 124	23 . . . . . 130
14	114	PHILIPPIANS.
17	125	
20	124	ii. 6 ff. . . . . 65, 89, 93,
vi. 6	133	116, 162, 188
vii. 23	127	iii. 21 . . . . . 97
viii. 3	66, 92, 123	COLOSSIANS.
29	115, 130	
32	218	i. 15 . . . . . 136, 194
ix. 2	87	16 . . . . . 31, 136
5	58, 98	18 . . . . . 87, 130, 137
33	31	iii. 9 . . . . . 90
x. 9	125	1 TIMOTHY.
		i. 7 . . . . . 72, 83
1 CORINTHIANS.		17 . . . . . 183
i. 18	45	ii. 5, 6 . . . . . 98, 111, 117,
23, 24	73	132, 134, 192
ii. 8	58, 73, 136, 224	vi. 16 . . . . . 222
16	113	2 TIMOTHY.
iii. 14	94	
v. 7	117	ii. 8 . . . . . 98, 117, 196
viii. 6	32	12 . . . . . 95
xi. 7	33	13 . . . . . 213
26	98	14 . . . . . 46
xv. 3, 4	56, 220	19 . . . . . 115
20	130	iii. 8 . . . . . 62
21	195	
23	53, 220	TITUS.
46	94	
48	137	ii. 13, 14 . . . . . 67
53	110	iii. 10, 11 . . . . . 63, 73
57	108	HEBREWS.
2 CORINTHIANS.		i. 3 . . . . . 30, 33
ii. 11	61	4, 5 . . . . . 100, 136
17	113	ii. 9 . . . . . 222
iv. 11	33	
v. 17, 18	32	
viii. 9	131	
xii. 6	60	

ii. 11 . . . . .	88, 216	1 S. PETER.
14 . . . . .	67, 126, 163, 216	
15 . . . . .	75	ii. 9 . . . . .
16, 17 . . . . .	51	22 . . . . .
iii. 1 . . . . .	166	130
iv. 15 . . . . .	122, 142	iii. 19 . . . . .
v. 1, ff . . . . .	167, 186	52
vi. 18 . . . . .	213	20 . . . . .
vii. 1-19 ff. . . . .	193	126
viii. 3 . . . . .	75, 100, 125	iv. 1 . . . . .
ix. 19 . . . . .	114	12, 67, 98, 142
26 . . . . .	59, 74, 113	v. 8 . . . . .
x. 5 . . . . .	186	63
9 . . . . .	125	2 S. PETER.
20 . . . . .	66, 130, 184	i. 4 . . . . .
xii. 12 . . . . .	214	ii. 19 . . . . .
12 . . . . .	219	66
xiii. 8 . . . . .	52	125
		1 S. JOHN.
		i. 1 . . . . .
S. JAMES.		90
i. 17 . . . . .	38	iii. 8 . . . . .
		106, 123
		16 . . . . .
		116, 137
		v. 20 . . . . .
		32

## ERRATUM.

p. 64, note i, *for* 'Epiphanius, in 374, imitated this,' *read* 'Epiphanius, in 373, imitated this.'



SERMONS, WORKS, &c., BY THE REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

---

PAROCHIAL SERMONS, Vol. I. With Preface. 8th Thousand.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS, Vol. II. 6th Thousand.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS, Vol. III. Revised Edition.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS, Preached on Various Occasions.

NEW VOLUME, In Preparation.

UNIVERSITY SERMONS, Vol. I. 1843—1855. With Preface.

UNIVERSITY SERMONS, Vol. II. 1859—1872. With Preface.

UNIVERSITY SERMONS, Vol. III. 1864—1879. With a Sermon at the opening of Keble College Chapel, 1876.

LENTEN SERMONS. 1858—1874.

SERMONS on Repentance and Amendment of Life. Preached at S. Saviour's, Leeds. 1845. With Preface. 3rd Edition.

*The above, 6s. each.*

ADDRESSES on the Love of GOD and of JESUS for Souls and the Blessedness of Intercession for Them. 5th Thousand. 3s. 6d.

COMMENTARY on the MINOR PROPHETS, with Introductions to the Several Books. 1 Volume. 4to. £1 11s. 6d.

LECTURES on DANIEL THE PROPHET. 5th Ed. 10s. 6d.

The DOCTRINE of HOLY BAPTISM. 5s.

The DOCTRINE of the REAL PRESENCE. 1855. 7s. 6d.

The REAL PRESENCE the DOCTRINE of the English Church. 2nd Edition. 1857. 6s.

WHAT IS OF FAITH AS TO EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT? 3s. 6d.

UNLAW in Judgements of the Judicial Committee and its Remedies. 2nd Edition. With an Appendix. 6d.

A LETTER on the Clause "AND THE SON," in the Nicene Creed. 1876. 3s. 6d.

HABITUAL CONFESSION not DISCOURAGED by the Resolution accepted by the Lambeth Conference. 1878. 6d.

CORRECTION of some CRITICISMS on the 'MANUAL for CONFESSORS.' 1879. 6d.

ADVICE ON HEARING CONFESSION. Revised Edition. With Preface. 6s.

PREFACE separately, (in wrapper,) 2s. 6d.

TRACT XC. On certain Passages in the XXXIX Articles. 1s. 6d.

Dr. PUSEY'S "DEVOTIONAL SERIES."

---

AVRILLON'S GUIDE for PASSING ADVENT HOLILY.

AVRILLON'S GUIDE for PASSING LENT HOLILY.

AVRILLON'S YEAR of AFFECTIONS.

NOUET'S LIFE of JESUS CHRIST in GLORY.

S. ANSELM'S MEDITATIONS and select PRAYERS.

*The above, 5s. each.*

SURIN'S FOUNDATIONS of the SPIRITUAL LIFE.

The SUFFERINGS of JESUS. In Two Parts, 3s. 6d. each.

The SPIRITUAL COMBAT. 2s. 6d.

" " Cheap Edition, in wrapper, 6d.

" " " " limp cloth, 1s.

PARADISE for the CHRISTIAN SOUL. By HORST. 6s. 6d.

DEVOUT COMMUNION. 1s. *From "the Paradise."*

LITANIES in the words of Holy Scripture. 6d.

ADVENT READINGS from the FATHERS. 2s.

LENT READINGS from the FATHERS. 3s. 6d.

MEDITATIONS on THE GOSPELS. 4 vols. *In Preparation.*

---

NEW AND CHEAPER ISSUE

OF

THE LIBRARY OF THE FATHERS

OF THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH,

ANTERIOR TO THE DIVISION OF THE EAST AND WEST.







Princeton Theological Seminary - Special Library



1 1012 01082 8202

DATE DUE

THE BOSTONIAN

THE BOSTONIAN

DE 2 1 1965

1976

JUN

REC 8

• 3 D. 2000

May 25 1990

W.M. BROWN

6.8 x 1.600

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



